NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10¢

Royal Oak, Michigan | September 29, 1941 | Subscription Three Dollars Per Year

FEWER JOBS IN SIGHT; BIGGER TAXES FOR ALL

(See Page 3)

British in Iran Fear Double-cross From Red Allies

(Story on Page 8)

Is Lindbergh a Liar? Critics Do Not Say So

(See Page 4)

How Popular Magazines Assault Christian Culture

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ U. S. IMPREGNABLE IS VIEW OF ARMY EXPERT ★ BRITISH PROMISE TO STOP LEASE-LEND PROFITEERING

Dinner Chat

Dear Reader:

To our knowledge, no other publication has been able to operate over a period of years with the limited field force which we employ. Thanks to you for your magnificent endeavors in spreading its merits by word of mouth advertising.

Our automatic direct mail circulation—i.e., readers enlisting other subscribers — operating free of subscription agencies, and minus paid solicitors in the field — has been the envy of other publications.

During the past month or so we are receiving daily a quantity of letters from interested persons who wish to purchase copies and cannot locate a source of supply or a SOCIAL JUSTICE salesman.

Then, too, we wish to intensify our Fall promotion work and squelch the idle rumors which are circulated to the effect that our publication is no longer on the market.

Potential subscribers, we understand, are sometimes given this wild excuse by our enemies to pacify them.

In order to get an immediate survey, and fill all gaps where salesmen are now missing, we are asking each reader this week to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and mail it at once. Partially, or in its entirety, either will help, but it should be mailed immediately.

What church do you regularly attend .....

Address of same — Street, City and State .....

Is there a regular SOCIAL JUSTICE Salesman stationed at the service you attend .....

Would you suggest that he have assistants to cope with the number who leave after each service or does he sufficiently cover the crowd .....

Have you noticed any lack of salesmen at some of your busy intersections? If so, give address of corner where foot traffic is heavy .....

Could you suggest a name of a boy, girl, man or woman who would be willing to handle a few copies a week .....

Address .....

Have you any suggestions whereby we could improve the contents of the paper and thereby make it more saleable .....

Mail immediately to the **Social Justice Publishing Company, Royal Oak, Mich.**

---

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of Government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. VIII September 29, 1941 No. 13

Lindbergh

Americans do not like to hear unpleasant truths any more than the British did, and on that account Lindbergh, who speaks them impolitically, is not universally popular at this critical moment," observes the *Witness*, official publication of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

"But that frank and far-seeing gentleman who warned the English clearly and confidently of Germany's strength and Russia's weakness has now plainly expressed his unbiased American opinion, according to press reports, 'that Soviet defeat is only a matter of weeks as far as the major military action is concerned.'

"The Lindbergh opinions, whether we like them or not, at least possess the merit of having been obtained by investigation on the ground and having been verified by events to date.

"And his standing as an expert and as a capable and loyal American had never been questioned until he delivered views and predictions that some of us do not approve.

"But similar views, based on intimate experience, have been expressed by other Americans — or at least American-born — who were captured by Finnish troops."

Cardinal Hinsley

According to a news dispatch, Cardinal Hinsley, of London, speaking to a regiment of Irish soldiers, said that England was "helping the Russian people and not Communism."

But it is impossible to give aid to Soviet Russia without, at the same time, aiding and abetting Communism.

Theoretically, it ought to be possible to distinguish between aid to Russia and aid to Communism, but, unfortunately, in fact, the distinction is not possible.

"Consequently," observes an editorial in the *Southern Cross* of San Diego, California, "all help given to perpetuate the present government of Russia is given to preserve the *status quo*, and this means simply 'aid to Communism.'

"Undoubtedly, millions of Russians feel and resent the cruel slavery that has been imposed upon them.

"There could be little objection to giving all aid to Russia if promises, above all suspicion of expediency, were given that the 'four freedoms' and 'eight points' would be firmly established after the war.

"As yet no such assurance has been given or asked. Consequently, aid to Russia is *collaboration* with Communism and, as such, is condemned by the words of Pope Pius XI."

When Pete Says Thanks, Folks, He Means It

HELLO, FOLKS:

How be ye, this fine day? Myself, I'm fine, but a littul bit lazy. I don't know why, but I s'pose I c'n blame it on th' change in th' seezuns. Mother Natchur has broad showlders 'n doesn't mind how menny things're blamed onta her. It's a good thing we have her t' use f'r this, isn't it? Jus' emajun how menny peepul's feelin's 're spared 'cuz we c'n blame th' wether fr our akes 'n pains 'n bad moods 'n not ourselves 'r our naybers.

Well, y'know I'm sorta short on offus gossup this week. Yep, they're all shuttin' up like a bunch uv klams when I come around now. Isn't that awful? I guess they think I tell all I know. Golly, they otta know better'n that! Jus' cuz I happuned t' menshun that Kate Clinton went out West 'n made a crack 'bout her failin' t' lassoo a cowboy t' bring back home with her 'n march up t' th' altar why she doesn't trust me enny more. She sez she'll not tell enny uv her persunal biznuss while I'm ennywhere within heerin' distunce.

Heh, heh, it looks like she's never herd uv th' ol' grapevine that servusus all newspapers. It's even better'n heerin' th' news first han' 'cuz by th' time it gets to you th' story's a wow! So I'm not worryin'. Only jus' now I haven't gotten around t' usin' this sorse uv infermashun. As I said before, I've got a lazy streek on right at this time.

Come t' think uv it — I c'd be kinda hurt at her remark that I can't be trusted not t' tell ev'rything I know. Why, there're a millyun 'n one things that I know that I never breeth t' a livin' soul. Take f'r instunce that 'nishul in front of Perrin Schwartz's name. That would be a krool thing I c'd do — it bein' even a more tender spot with him than bein' bald 'n as toothless as a four-month old baby. I hafta put it at this age limut, on akkount uv I don't know much 'bout when babies have their teeth, but Bucky O'Connor came in this mornin' 'n prowdly announst that Robert Benson — that's his littul son, cut his first tooth 'n he's only five months old. All th' girls in th' offus thought that was wunderful. I don't know if it reely is 'r wether they jus' wanted t' make Bucky feel good. Sumtimes y' can't tell 'bout wimmen. They don't mind gushin' a bit over things if it'll make sumbuddy feel better, do they? I guess bein' that way doesn't hurt none, at that.

* * *

'Corse, I'm not like that myself. When I say that I think all you folks that've been readin' SOCIAL JUSTICE 'n workin' so hard t' live up to its prinsupuls 'n tryin' with all y'r might 'n main t' get other subskribers f'r us so's we c'n keep on livin' in these hektik days — when I say y're just 'bout the grandust folks I know 'n y're tops with me — why that is not th' ol' soft soap. Nosirree. That, my frien's, is th' reel McCoy — I mean it right from th' bottom uv this ol' dog-heart that is here sumware inside uv me.

As I said before — I'm no palaverer. I've been told there's a book that tells y' how t' be one — it's called *"How t' Win Friends 'n Influounce Peepul"* — but I've never seen it so I haven't been influounct by it.

When I say thanks f'r ev'rythin' — why I'm sayin it cuz I meen it 'n not becuz it's th' thing t' do.

Well, f'r one who didn't have ennything t' say, I've rattled on f'r quite a spell, haven't I? I guess it'd be in order if I said goodbye. So I'll say it.

Goodbye 'n good luck t' y. 'N thanks f'r whatever y' might do in th' way uv gettin' a new subskripshun with this littul coupon jus' below.

— PETE.

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date.....

Name .....

Address..... City.....

State..... Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

Fewer Jobs, Higher Taxes Lie Ahead

DONALD M. NELSON, the key-man in the new Supply Priorities and Allocations Board — although Vice-President Wallace is chairman — recently delivered a nationally-broadcast radio speech, several points of which ought to be considered by all thoughtful Americans.

"We have only begun to feel the effects of this defense program," he said. "Everything that has been done so far is preliminary. Much has been accomplished. We are today, for example, producing finished defense goods at a rate of one and a quarter billion dollars a month — a remarkable achievement, but not nearly enough.

"Take everything we have done so far and then double it. Our slogan henceforth might well be 'double or nothing.' If we don't double our present effort, and pile still more on top of that, we face the fate that has overtaken a dozen other nations who gave too little and gave it too late."

Declaring that from now on a line would be drawn between "the things we have to have and the things we can temporarily get along without," Nelson added:

"That means — for the duration of the emergency — *a somewhat lower standard of living for all of us. We might just as well face that fact without trying to disguise it.*"

A lower standard of living for all of us!

The adjective "somewhat" could just as well be left out. It will be brought about by the middle class being battered on the anvil of unemployment by the hammer of increased taxation.

* * *

Several years ago, Father Coughlin told the American people that the Administration could lift the exploited peoples of Europe and Asia to the famed American standard of living if honest policies were pursued. If the wrong course was followed, he warned, we would descend to the level of the European peasant and the Asiatic coolie.

The Administration has joined forces with the internationalists who are pledged to destruction and war.

Business leaders, Government leaders, and union representatives are aware of the trend and have held conferences.

But they are caught in the swift current set up and directed by the international financiers.

The only concrete things they have been able to guarantee the workers is that their "seniority rights" are to be protected! But a man out of work can't live on seniority!

* * *

Along this line, Boake Carter, in his syndicated column, had the following excellent analysis:

"The O.P.M., the *New York Times* reports, has secretly prepared a list of more than forty industries, involving thousands of business firms, which must retrench drastically or close their doors because of the raw material bottleneck.

"The prospect of unemployment due to priorities by Christmas — certainly by Spring — may make the unemployment breadlines of 1933 look like prosperity in comparison.

"Unemployment, provoked by thousands of business firms forced to close down, suggests that the Government will be faced with responsibility of seeing to it that a large number of Americans, made jobless by President Roosevelt's policies, do not starve.

"The simplest way of doing this is to impress civilians who lose their jobs in industries into the Army. The prospect, therefore, is for a still larger Army.

"Men being released from the Army must be given back their jobs in civil life, according to law. If, however, several thousand business firms retrench drastically or shut down altogether, many soldiers released from the Army face loss of their civil jobs in a short time. Their prospect is limited to going back to the Army, as a matter of self-preservation.

* * *

"The Government, however, cannot so relieve increasing unemployment without income. The prospect is that the few who remain working will face doubled income taxes — that is, doubled on the prospective increase now virtually completed in the Congress; doubling Social Security taxes and a capital levy by the United States Government on every citizen's weekly wage, called by the politicians 'compulsory savings' for patriotic purposes."

The prospect, therefore, expands itself to this picture, according to Boake Carter:

"That the majority of the people of the United States will be working, at the end of another six to twelve months, for the United States Government, which seems to be largely Mr. Roosevelt, for approximately from two thirds to four fifths of a year.

"More and more property and homes unable to be maintained because of the rapaciousness of Government demands, operating in accord with the President's policies, will be abandoned and the home life of the nation — its backbone — be destroyed. This will be a problem for churchmen.

"The Government, besides the standard array of taxes, will reach an additional hand into the citizen's pocketbook and take, by law, still more to throw after what it has already spent.

* * *

"Were we manufacturing for our own defense and that of this hemisphere, so many priorities would not be needed to siphon off such vast amounts of raw materials.

"The President has decided, however, that his policy shall be an 'arsenal' to supply war machines and food to as many nations as can be found who will resist the Axis. The ideal is as noble as Mr. Wilson's . . .

"Roosevelt's ideal is to keep America out of physical combat, but turn the nation into a total 'arsenal' to produce for all the nations on the firing line.

"The more foreign customers we contract to supply, the more priorities are required to divert greater and still greater quantities of raw materials to meeting those total demands.

"And the less and less materials remain for 130-million Americans to live on within the United States, and the faster develops the total disintegration of the United States domestic structure."

Index to Comment

Fewer Jobs, Higher Taxes Lie Ahead ..... Page 3

Is Lindbergh a Liar? ..... Page 4

We Raised $13-million, Not One U.S.O. 'Hut' ..... Page 5

Editorials: Aid to Soviet Helps Communism; Freedom of the Seas; Oregon Demands Free Speech ..... Page 6

Roosevelt Warning Is Still Sound ..... Page 7

Behind the War: Britain in Iran Fears Red Double-cross; British Promise to Stop Lease-Lend Profiteering ..... Page 8

Churchill on the Skids; Bolshevism Comes First ..... Page 9

U. S. Impregnable, Army Man's View; Minnesota Clubs Study Money ..... Page 10

Our Last Chance to Save Business; Slaughter of the Middle Class; Production for Peace ..... Page 11

Fr. O'Brien Calls War Stark Madness ..... Page 12

Wyeth Williams; Get Ready for New Order in U.S.A. ..... Page 13

Comment from Readers (four pages of your letters) ..... Pages 14-17

Magazines Lead Assault on Christian Culture ..... Page 18

Anti-Semitism in Congress ..... Page 19

Mexico for the Mexicans! ..... Page 20

Breadlines Again

LEO M. CHERNE, executive secretary of the Research Institute of America, Inc., said recently that the Office of Production Management was understood to have prepared to a "secret list of more than 40 industries" embracing thousands of business concerns which face retrenchment or shutdown as a result of "raw material starvation."

Mr. Cherne told 100 district managers at a four-day meeting in New York that this "starvation" under the present priorities system would make "priorities unemployment almost as dramatic before the end of this year as the breadlines of 1933."

Is Lindbergh a Liar?

ALL BUT dwarfing the routine war news of the week, the "Jewish question," as it is called, grabbed the limelight in newspapers from one end of the country to the other.

For once Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine are out of it — their "whipping boy" this time is young Charlie Lindbergh.

But, in the interest of accuracy and a complete record, it should be said that Mr. Lindbergh's speech at Des Moines did not "bring out" the Jewish question at all. If you will look back over the same newspapers you will discover that this had been done several days earlier.

It was Vendell Villkie, the corporation lawyer and campaign orator whom the Republicans put up to challenge the champion in 1940, and who was lately made a director in the Lehmans' international Jewish banking house, who opened up the Jewish question in America.

As counsel for the motion picture industry, threatened with a U. S. Senate investigation, Mr. Willkie told the newspapers that charges of war-mongering in the movies was "persecution of the Jews."

And it was by way of refutation of Willkie that Lindbergh spoke at Des Moines.

Mr. Lindbergh in his address made the simple statement that three groups are striving to involve this nation in foreign war: (1) the British; (2) the Jewish; and (3) the Roosevelt administration.

There has been no hullabaloo about Number 1.

The British themselves would be the first to admit that they are seeking all-out American aid; that they even want American ships and fighting men in their wair.

The City of Washington, D. C., is fairly crawling with British emissaries, all driven with the single purpose of involving America.

Nor, has there been any uproar at Lindbergh's mention of Number 3.

Any American above the age of 6 years knows that our New Deal administration is belligerent. As far back as 1934 it was the announced intention to destroy Germany.

The public pronouncements of President Roosevelt and all his New Deal satellites have long been studded with name-calling, hate-inspiring invective, and bellicose threats against the Axis powers.

* * *

But, as usual, mention of the Jews as a group, and their collective activities during this national crisis, has brought forth an eruption of protest and a flood of abuse upon the head of Charles A. Lindbergh.

The Hearst newspapers — under what pressure the public does not know — immediately undertook an amazing symposium. Leaders in many fields were interviewed.

Among these were some prominent Jews but most of them were non-Jews, many of the type who practice tolerance in public and anti-Semitism in private.

The consensus of the interviewees was that the injection of racial prejudice in the United States at this time is most deplorable.

To sum up the entire symposium—in the Hearst press and other newspapers—it is just too bad that in a serious national situation like this that any mention should be made of Jews as a group; it is base and un-American to say anything about Jews at all —especially to say that they are for war.

Of course it is deplorable.

It is also deplorable that there is a war raging in the world. It is deplorable that there are bombings and sinkings and starvation and death.

There are many conditions of human life "deplorable" — but they are, nevertheless, facts. And so it is a deplorable fact that Lindbergh uttered when he said that powerful Jewish interests in the United States constitute a war-mongering group.

* * *

If this were not true, these Jewish-inspired newspaper attacks on Lindbergh would not be based upon the raising of a racial issue.

Instead, they would be calculated to prove Lindbergh a liar!

A terrific effort would be made to prove that the speaker falsified when he said that the Jews as a group were in favor of war.

If this could be done, Lindbergh would be completely discredited in the eyes of all the people.

But it cannot be done, for the reason that Lindbergh uttered the truth.

Therefore, smear Lindbergh!

Show that he is a low, dastardly villain to state or even insinuate that Jewish interests favor war!

Appeal to the broad-mindedness and Christian charity of the American people. *Evade the issue!*

Never discuss whether a speaker told the truth or lied.

Make him stink in the nostrils of public esteem!

* * *

That's the way the same *clique* always fights.

Almost three years ago Father Coughlin invited Jews to join Christians in condemning religious persecution; the anti-Christian persecution of Communism, as well as the Nazi German persecution of Jews.

His answer was a widely circulated book prepared by the Jewish General Council, which set out to assert that Jews were not behind Communism in Soviet Russia.

Of course, that was not the question at all, but certain friends of Father Coughlin brought out *"An Answer to Father Coughlin's Critics"* and sadly shattered the assertions and half-truths and inaccuracies of the Jewish smear book.

Besides that, Father Coughlin was taken off the air. Although he has been silent for more than a year, there is hardly an issue of a Jewish magazine or the *Communist Daily Worker* but the silenced Radio priest is attacked in the most scathing terms.

And all because he invited Jews to join Christians in condemning Communism!

Consult the index of any school or city library and under "Coughlin" you will find the Jewish General Council's book attacking Father Coughlin. The "Answer" has been removed from the files as fast as it has been supplied.

So, in the case of Lindbergh, do not meet his charge. Smear him as an "anti-Semite."

* * *

Except for the New York *Herald Tribune* and the syndicated column of Miss Dorothy Thompson, which enter a sort of general denial, almost no critic of Lindbergh attacked the factuality of his utterance.

Said the *Herald Tribune*:

"To state that Jews exert an influence in this country out of proportion to their numbers is to state what is unproved and unprovable; to state that their influence is exerted as Jews and not as American citizens is to libel not only the Jews but the whole American system."

And Miss Thompson sums up:

"If every American Jew died tomorrow it would not make the slightest difference in the policy of the movies, the radio, the Government or the press."

Thus, both the *Herald Tribune* and the naive Miss Thompson assert that Jews do not control the press, the movies, the radio, etc.

But that, again, was not the question.

Mr. Lindbergh merely said that the Jewish influence—such as it is, whatever it is —is working to get the United States into the war against Hitler.

Not even the *Herald Tribune* or Miss Thompson would venture to assert that any Jews of influence are against the war.

And that is the whole issue—not "anti-Semitism" at all.

* * *

American Jews—they never call themselves Jewish-Americans — can discredit Mr. Lindbergh in any one of several ways:

The General Jewish Council has been abolished; its work, it seems, was not satisfactory. But any of its successors—let us say Mr. Monsky's B'nai B'rith—could meet in solemn conclave and declare itself unalterably opposed to American intervention in this European war or any other foreign war.

The Mayers, the Goldwyns, the Warners, the Foxes, the Loews, the Schuberts, the Shumlins, the Blumenthals and the Kauffmans could use such influence as they have to turn American motion pictures and theater stages into mirrors of genuine American nationalism, instead of keeping them in their present condition of seething media for pro-war propaganda.

Jewish rabbis can take the air, as does Lindbergh — and as Father Coughlin can not do—and tell the American people that American Jewry as a whole is willing to use its power towards keeping this country out of war and thus saving the lives of millions of Gentiles.

The Jewish press could take a tip from

(Continued on Page 7)

'None of OUR Business'

We Raised $13-Million, Not One U.S.O. 'Hut'

REMEMBER, months ago, when you contributed to the United Service Organization's fund for recreation facilities for our boys in the Army camps?

Well, *not one single building has been erected by the Government at any camp!*

And Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, and President Roosevelt's man to spend our $13-million dollars on recreation huts at the Army camps, says:

"It is none of the U.S.O.'s business what we do about buildings or how or where we build them!"

You could hardly put it plainer than that.

You and your church, and your lodge, and your community club, contributed $13-million — and it is none of your business what the Government does for the recreational welfare of your boys.

Commenting upon this situation the *Chicago Tribune* said editorially, "The New Dealers are too busy trying to get the boys across the ocean to see that they are trained to fight if they get there!"

And, like the *Chicago Tribune*, SOCIAL JUSTICE is going to be called "obstructionist" and "pro-Nazi" for repeating it.

But, we ask you, is it "pro-Nazi" or pro-American to demand results after we have contributed $13-million?

In the World War we had recreational facilities — the Y.M.C.A., the Knights of Columbus, the Jewish organizations, the Salvation Army, etc., etc. This time, the Government said it would do it, but that we would have to put up the money. We did, and now we are told it is none of our business whether the Government puts up any camp "huts" or not.

We think it is the business of the American people, and we are not inclined to let any trumped-up war emergency shut off our inquiries.

* * *

Thomas E. Dewey of New York, chairman of the U.S.O., declared:

"We raised $2,250,000 more than our goal but the Government hasn't produced a single building — not one!

"It is costing the U.S.O. considerable additional money — $300,000 already — to carry out the program while we wait for the Government.

"We have *had to rent quarters in 29 communities* and this money we did not figure on spending."

Back of the Dewey-McNutt statements is a long and bitter row, which started in the early days of the U.S.O., the *Tribune* reports.

A chief cause for the fight — and for the delay in the construction of buildings — is a difference of opinion as to what kind of structures should be built.

Army officers and the officials of towns near camps want large buildings of brick and stone.

"We are not interested in 1944," said Dewey. "We want buildings that can be thrown up in 10 to 20 days. We need them now. This long term planning of long distance centers is hardly excusable."

Mr. McNutt told newspaper men that "everything is being done to expedite the buildings" but he admitted that "Government processes are a little slow."

"Certain elements," he said, "are trying to make a political football out of a very delicate thing. Certain men see this as an opportunity to hit the Administration with another stink bomb. I won't let them do it. I am going to wield a wild and wicked shillalah to beat it out."

So incensed was McNutt at Dewey's criticism that he hinted he was going to carry the row to President Roosevelt.

Harper Sibley, of Rochester, New York, permanent president of the U.S.O., shook his head unhappily over the whole situation.

"I'm afraid," said Mr. Sibley, "the biggest bottleneck is the President's desk. But I don't want to criticize our President at a time like this.

"The boys in the camps are getting restless, but bids for 58 new buildings are being received now. They should go into construction within three or four weeks — I hope."

* * *

And an editorial in the same Chicago newspaper says:

"Soldiers of the Wisconsin-Michigan National Guard division wrecked a saloon near Alexandria, La., apparently because the owner had raised the price of beer. During the fracas the owner shot one of the soldiers.

"This and other recent occurrences give a disturbing picture of the morale of the Army. The men are plainly disgruntled . . .

"For this situation there are numerous causes, but most of them stem back to the War Department and the war-mongers in the Roosevelt administration who have persisted in placing propaganda ahead of defense in the preparedness program.

"Morale in the Army would be better if the men felt that they were receiving something effective in the way of military training.

"Too many of them were called into service. There were not enough modern weapons to arm them, nor enough efficient officers to instruct them. The men know that *the time they have given to their country has largely been wasted*, and they resent this.

"Too many camps, it is apparent, were located with a view to political spoils. The Army pay roll was regarded as so much political pork. That has meant the exploiting of soldiers with $21 a month to spend. The Alexandria trouble, it may be noted, apparently arose from an increase in the price of beer. It is the story of Rudyard Kipling's Tommy Atkins over again, and that, it should be repeated, at the expense of young men of the caliber of the present Army personnel, is outrageous.

"It was to meet this problem of Army morale that the people of this country contributed $13-million to the United Service Organizations. The program has bogged down, through no fault of the contributors or the leaders of the U.S.O. Thomas E. Dewey, chairman of the U.S.O. drive, said at Rochester, New York, Friday, that the Government has fallen down completely on its share of the U.S.O. program.

"The Government was to build $15-million worth of quickly erected wooden structures in which the activities for the men in service were to be carried on. The fund to carry on these services has been oversubscribed. *The Government, says Mr. Dewey, has not built a single structure.* Plans for a number of the buildings were turned over to the W.P.A., which is boondoggling with them in its traditional way.

"The Army training program has been carried out with typical New Deal incompetence."

Defense Housing

AS THE by-product of its investigation of migratory labor in connection with the national defense program, the Tolan Committee of the House of Representatives may come up with evidence revealing political shennanigans in defense housing projects.

At a hearing in July, while inquiring into the housing phase of migratory labor problems, the committee heard some particularly interesting testimony from John M. Carmody, Federal Works Agency administrator.

Mr. Carmody testified that his department was told to build 1,000 houses to shelter shipyard workers at Fore River, Massachusetts. Later, however, he was pressured to forego this construction and buy, instead, the new housing project in South Boston, which he characterized as a "slum clearance project."

He wondered why a site some distance away from the workers' place of employment should be pressed upon his department. Representatives of the shipyard workers felt the same, coming to him and protesting against the acquisition of the project in South Boston.

Nevertheless, he told the Committee, Charles F. Palmer, co-ordinator of the division of defense housing in the Office of Production Management, pressed him to buy Boston property and he finally consented to do it—against his better judgment.

"We bought that property and we paid $1-million more for it than we ought to have paid for the same accommodations," Carmody declared.

Then, he said, the Fore River workers refused to occupy the South Boston quarters, despite appeals from the management. Subsequently, the homes were thrown open to the Charleston navy yard workers, but it was charged recently in the Boston city council that the development still has many vacant apartments.

Mr. Carmody ascribed his compliance to Palmer's pressure to the fact that Palmer was "fortified with an executive order" which he promptly flashed to smother opposition to his suggestions.

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Aid to Soviet Helps Communism

WE ARE travelling a road built by hands not our own. We are "fellow travellers" to a destination which we cannot see.

"The supreme stupidity will be if we fool ourselves about the company we are in," warns the *Wall Street Journal.*

"At this writing," the editorial warns, "the rulers of Russia appear to be men who know what they are about, what odds they face and — this is most important — who will be responsible if Germany is defeated on land.

"It follows that they will want to apportion the spoils accordingly.

"In our opinion a Europe dominated by a Russian totalitarian would be altogether as bad for this nation's peace of mind as a Europe dominated by a German totalitarian.

"There is room for grave doubt that, if the American people had envisioned any such possibility, they would never have approved many of the steps which our Government has taken."

For that matter have the American people approved them? What chance have we had to approve anything?

Our information is that 80 per cent of the people are — and have been — against Mr. Roosevelt's war from the beginning. Don't forget that they elected him chiefly because they thought he'd keep us out of war longer than Willkie could.

* * *

Interventionists continue to make the illogical distinction that America and Britain are aiding Soviet Russia to defeat Germany; because German Naziism is a greater enemy to democracy than Russian Communism.

Then we hear otherwise intelligent people saying that the allies can aid Russia but not Communism; as if one could aid Soviet Russia and hate Communism!

It should be obvious to everyone that the distinction is baseless.

It reminds one of the sophistic distinction made by Maxim Litvinov when the United States protested that Soviet Russia was violating every pledge and provision of the *Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement* of 1935.

The Soviet ambassador said that the Soviet government was not responsible for the Communist Party and the Communist International; even though all members of the government must be high ranking Communist Party members and are *de facto* leaders of the Communist International.

The United States cannot aid Soviet Russia without aiding Communism; for the continued existence of the Red government means the preservation of Communism.

Interventionists themselves should be the first to condemn this specious reasoning. In fact, they do condemn all isolationists as "Nazis" and sympathizers with the German nation as "Nazi agitators" and propagandists.

If an isolationist protests that he has only hatred for Naziism but sympathy for Germany, interventionists point out that there can be no distinction between Naziism and Germany.

With even more reason, there can be no distinction between Soviet Russia and Red Communism.

Freedom of the Seas

AMONG other platitudes the one concerning freedom of the seas has been trotted out by Mr. Roosevelt, dusted off and placed in the propaganda showcase as the joint exhibit of himself and Winston Churchill.

For Prime Minister Churchill to pledge himself to be co-guarantor of the "freedom of the seas" is as much at variance with established British policy as a Roosevelt promise to guarantee the resumption of negro slavery would be to American policy.

Freedom of the seas is simply incompatible with British imperialism.

President Wilson discovered that when he attempted to incorporate that freedom in the peace plan of the first World War.

In the conversations preceding the Versailles conference, Wilson made his proposal for "freedom of the seas," but the measure was so quickly and flatly rejected by Great Britain that he surrendered on that issue as he did later on others in his famous 14 Points.

* * *

Mr. David Lloyd George, in his *"Memoirs of the Peace Conference,"* wrote:

"As to the former *(Point 2)*, speaking on behalf of the British Government, I declared that I could not accept that clause . . .

"Mr. Balfour and I, for the reasons I have given, were quite resolved that we could not give in on the right of naval blockade, even if the war had to be prosecuted to the end without any further help from President Wilson . . .

"Gradually President Wilson *was made to realize that he was up against a tradition that could not be overthrown . . .*

"As regards the freedom of the seas, the above declaration enabled the President to say that he had not given way, but had only postponed the settlement of the subject at the peace conference. I felt convinced that nothing more would be heard of the subject. My confidence was justified, for the topic was never alluded to in any of our discussions in Paris when we were framing the treaty."

* * *

Those whose memories have not been too beclouded by British propaganda will recall that one of the reasons for our entrance into the first World War was our insistence upon the right to freedom of the seas — a right which Germany disputed inasmuch as we were exercising it to aid the Allies with shipments of war materials.

We went to war on the side of Britain to defend a right which Britain itself did not adhere to and refused to recognize.

Who believes that Great Britain has changed its tradition? Or that, with its long history of double-crossing, the British Empire will abide by any promise which it may later find advantageous to repudiate?

Oregon Demands Free Speech

THE "weight of public opinion on the side of free speech" was credited with having impelled the Portland, Oregon, city council to reverse itself and authorize use of the Municipal auditorium for an anti-war address by United States Senator Burton K. Wheeler.

Informally, the council had decided to refuse the permission.

Meantime, letters to newspapers, editorial comment, and communications to the councilmen, convinced the city body that they had made a bad guess in assaying Oregon public sentiment on the question of free speech.

Many of the public objections came from persons who disagree with Senator Wheeler's stand on the war but who insisted that free discussion of public matters was a more important issue than their disagreement with the isolationist.

The 80 per cent against war are speaking up. But, more important, Americans are awake — at least, in Portland, Oregon.

Comment

Roosevelt Warning Is Still Sound

BACK IN THE DAYS before Great Britain became involved in the desperate fight to save its vast empire and to preserve its creaking economic system, President Roosevelt uttered many a wise word concerning war and peace.

He gave the American people to understand that United States participation in another world conflict would be utterly disastrous, not only to this generation but to generations yet unborn.

In currently opposing American intervention in the present war, SOCIAL JUSTICE, and other critics of the Administration's war policy, are merely *acting in accordance with the truths once stated by the President himself, but since repudiated by him.*

In 1936, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"The men, women and children of the Americas know that warfare in this day and age means more than the mere clash of armies. They foresee that children and grandchildren, if they survive, will stagger for long years under the burden of poverty, but also amid the threat of broken society and the destruction of constitutional government."

But the situation has "changed," the interventionists say.

What has changed? we ask. If the President's words were true in 1936 they are still true.

The fact that Great Britain is fighting for her empire, and Soviet Russia is fighting for godless Communism, does not alter the fact that war would be disastrous for America.

The tyrant who rules over Germany is 3,000 miles distant. It is admitted, even by many interventionists, that should Hitler conquer all of Europe he still would be unable to penetrate our shores.

Only a year ago Chief of Staff George C. Marshall expressed the opinion that a well trained, well equipped army of 750,000 men could successfully defend America. We now have some 1½-million in training.

Our air force could be growing by leaps and bounds were the Government not disposed to give the bulk of airplane production to nations abroad.

Our navy is considered the world's greatest.

* * *

No one, of course, can read Hitler's mind, The interventionists try to, however, insisting that the United States must crush Naziism before it crushes us. They prefer certain war and certain economic disaster in a foreign conflict to a problematical war of defense where the odds in our favor would be overwhelmingly great.

Another interventionist argument is that Hitler would ruin America economically by stealing our foreign trade. That, also, is specious. Only 5 to 10 per cent of this country's business consists in foreign commerce.

Would the loss of that ruin America?

Foreign nations need our market more than we need theirs.

SOCIAL JUSTICE does not accept the premise that we would lose all our foreign trade or that we would be denied access to essential raw materials. It would simply be a matter of good business for Hitler to trade with the United States. Japan has found it so.

As for competing with "slave labor" under Hitler — haven't we always competed with the slave labor of India, China and other exploited lands?

Then, they say, we must defeat Hitler because we have a "moral obligation to rid the world of ruthless dictators," of enemies of Christianity and democracy.

That is the most shallow of all their arguments.

This Government never undertook to destroy the bloody regime of Stalinism, but, instead, has continuously endeavored to tighten the bonds of friendship with that murderous despotism.

This Government did not interfere when, a few years ago, the rulers of Great Britain sent hordes of criminals to murder, starve and persecute the Catholics of Ireland who wanted only independence and freedom of religious worship.

In what respect, therefore, has the situation "changed" so as to nullify the truths expounded by President Roosevelt in 1936?

Actually, it hasn't. But the war-mongers and hate-mongers are in the saddle. They are not only scornful of truth but relentless in trying to convert that scorn into popular acceptance through the medium of the press, the radio and motion pictures.

To date only a minority of the public — once fooled — have fallen victims of their propaganda.

The remainder — the 80 per cent against war — will never fall if they keep prominently in mind President Roosevelt's 1936 admonition:

"The men, women and children of the Americas know that warfare in this day and age means more than the mere clash of armies. They foresee that children and grandchildren, if they survive, will stagger for long years under the burden of poverty, but *also amid the threat of broken society and the destruction of constitutional government!*"

Did Lindbergh Lie?

(Continued from Page 4)

Hearst and conduct a symposium of Jewish leaders and show by its quotation from them their opposition to war.

The Saranoffs, the Paleys, the Bambergers and the Strausses could devote much time on their national radio hook-ups to anti-war propaganda, instead of polluting, as now, many hours of the day and night with the venom of international hatred calculated to inflame the minds of the people toward war.

When these steps—or any of them—are taken the American people will conclude that their Jewish fellow citizens are for America first, and opposed to this nation's intervention in foreign war.

Then we will know that Mr. Lindbergh is a liar.

Until then, Americans may reasonably conclude that Mr. Lindbergh spoke the truth but that the truth was "unwise," "deplorable" or even "anti-Semitic."

In other words, Mr. Lindbergh may be "anti-Semitic" but he is not a falsifier.

Two Jewish Groups Answer Lindbergh

A JOINT statement by the "American Jewish Committee" and the "Jewish Labor Committee" calls Mr. Lindbergh's charges "unsupported and unsupportable"; but it does not say that Jewish influence—such as it is—is against this country' entrance into the war.

The statement denies that there are any "Jewish interests" outside of common patriotism for America and asserts that Jews as individuals are free to be either for or against the war.

Mr. Lindbergh said that one of the three major groups in America pressing for this country's entrance into the war was "the Jewish."

The "answer" of these representative Jewish Committees to that specific charge is the following statement:

"On Sept. 11, at Des Moines, Ia., Mr. Lindbergh made an unsupported and unsupportable charge impugning the patriotism of Americans of Jewish faith.

"The overwhelming denunciation with which the charge has been met from coast to coast by the press and by leaders of all faiths places it in the category in which it belongs.

"It is not serious argument, but only another example of the now familiar tactics of the Nazis to divide other countries by stirring up religious and racial hatreds and setting group against group. In supporting these tactics and accusing others of lack of patriotism, Mr. Lindbergh's charges react only upon himself.

"Americans of Jewish faith, in common with Americans of every other faith, denounce Hitler's persecution of the Jews and his numberless other crimes against civilization. But the sympathy of any group of Americans for any people in any other land is wholly distinct from their basic American interests. Each of us answers for himself the question whether the United States is or is not next on Hitler's list of victims and what our foreign policy should be.

"As everyone knows, Jews in this country represent in all respects, save a common religion, a cross-section of the American population, with all the differences of viewpoint which such a cross-section includes.

"As individuals, each one of us has a right to his views, whether for or againt isolationism, without fear that Mr. Lindbergh can intimidate any of us with the low and baseless charge that there are other 'interests' which we place ahead of loyalty to our country.

"In fact, Mr. Lindbergh, in order to secure converts for his own point of view, counsels that we should do just that. He warns Jews to support his policy on the ground that any other attitude would lead to anti-Semitism.

"We are obliged to Mr. Lindbergh for his gratuitous advice and reject completely his un-American appeal to selfish interests. We will not put even what he considers our 'interests' before those of our country — since our interests and those of our country are one and indivisible."

Comment

Behind the War

Britain in Iran Fears Red Double-Cross

BY THEIR joint conquest of Iran, Great Britain and Soviet Russia have put themselves in a favorable position to block Germany's long anticipated drive in the direction of India, Suez and Egypt, but at the same time it brings a new peril to Britain should Russia capitulate suddenly to the Nazis.

The British fear that Soviet Russia, driven to the wall by Germany, might sign another *Brest Litovsk treaty* and not only surrender all newly acquired territory, but receive in return the territories in the Near East which Hitler promised Molotov as compensation for Russo-German alliance.

British diplomats realize that the Russians, after suffering a series of disastrous defeats, might be inclined to accept such a negotiated peace from Hitler. Of course, such a treaty would be made at the expense of British-controlled territories in the Near East and the Orient.

Thus, although the invasion of Iran was a joint Anglo-Russian undertaking to block a move in that direction by Hitler, to gain secure control of Iranian oil in case Ukrainian oil fields were lost or destroyed, and to open a new supply line of British and American war materials, the British had additional motives.

With good reason they do not place implicit faith in the Red Rulers of Russia. Their fighting partnership with the Communists has not blinded them to the fact of the Reds' propensity for double-crossing. Consequently, the British action in Iran was somewhat in the nature of insurance against possible Soviet treachery.

When Sir Archibald Wavell was transferred to Simla it became evident that Britain was planning to move troops into Iran, and this was soon done in co-operation with the British fleet. The British had not forgotten Russia's designs for ports on the Persian gulf — one of the baits Hitler offered Stalin to immobilize the Soviet.

* * *

The position of Turkey in the new developments is uncertain, even though that nation is supposedly under Soviet influence, has agreements with Britain and is allied with Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Turks profess respect for their treaties with Britain, but there is no telling what they would do if Nazi pressure should be increased to the point where a definite decision would have to be made.

Nations caught in the dilemma facing Turkey must be careful to fall in with the winning side, for, if they line up with the losers, they invariably suffer territorial losses and other punitive measures at the "peace" conferences.

Apparently, Turkey intends to wait until the last possible moment to cast the die.

If she can remain neutral altogether Turkey unquestionably would prefer that course, but if she must fight then she wants to be certain of choosing the "right" teammates.

Meanwhile the Turks fear both Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany and look with suspicion on Britain's moves in Iraq and Iran.

* * *

As stated previously, Great Britain's military strategy is governed by two objectives: the continuation of war between Russia and Germany; and the checkmating of any Russian move which, in the event of a Russo-German peace, would jeopardize the British Empire.

The belief that Russia can hold off the Germans indefinitely, and that a stalemate will result, bringing about the exhaustion of both the Soviets and the Nazis, has never been justified. Actually the odds from the very beginning have been against the Russians.

Cognizant of that, the British are taking no chances with their current historically treacherous ally.

Britain Promises to Stop Profiteering

GREAT BRITAIN'S grave concern over the charge that materials obtained from the United States under the *Lease-Lend Act* were being used to compete directly with American goods in foreign markets, and to promote and preserve Britain's international trade, indicates that the charges were true in some instances.

The British government now has promised to prevent such misuse of leased and loaned materials, and to restrict British exports.

Such promises and limitations would, of course, be needless and useless, unless the charges had been true.

The British government is said to have been especially incensed, among other things, over what its leaders called the "propaganda value to Germany" of the charges that American industry, after sacrificing to send materials to England under the *Lease-Lend Act,* was being hit in its foreign markets by British goods made from these raw materials — goods that in many instances undersold equivalent American-made goods.

* * *

The new agreement with the United States is announced in a so-called *"White Paper"* and is said by a reliable source to be one of a series of steps planned to prevent Germany from using *Lease-Lend* grumbling as the thin edge of a wedge to pry Britain and the United States apart, and to hamper allied war effort.

Your commentator's informant said that Britain expects such a German propaganda campaign to come to a head soon, and wants to be able to meet it.

He disclosed further that the campaign is now under way in Britain as well as the United States; that, by word of mouth, seeds of dissension are being sowed in English "pubs" and factories.

In Britain, the accusation is made that the United States is "using the *Lease-Lend Act* to force Britain to cease importing"; so that the greedy United States can "seize all British markets and force British laborers out of jobs after the war."

The charge also is heard that Britain has been exporting *Lease-Lend* materials to South America, in order to prevent these markets falling into the hands of American traders.

* * *

The *"White Paper"* consisted of correspondence between Secretary Anthony Eden and United States Ambassador Winant, regarding the *Lease-Lend Agreement;* and a "memorandum" in general terms stating the reasons for and the background of the agreement.

The memorandum, which accompanied a letter from Eden to Winant, made these points:

1) All materials the British obtained under the *Lease-Lend* "are required for prosecution of the war effort" and the British government promises to "continue to take action" to prevent diversions "to the furtherance of private interests."

2) *Lease-Lend* material has not been used and will not be used by the British for export. (Editor's note — This does not include material purchased under "cash and carry," which *Lease-Lend* material has already replaced, or British-made goods, which can be replaced with *Lease-Lend* material.)

3) The British "have not and will not apply any materials similar to those supplied under *Lease-Lend* in such a way as to enable exporters to enter new markets or extend their export trade" at the expense of United States exports.

(Editor's note — A reliable informant from Britain said that the basis for the charge that Britain was selling *Lease-Lend* material was to be found in the fact that Britain was exporting goods of the "cash and carry" days and contracted for then but delivered during the time of *Lease-Lend.*)

4) From its promises not to export *Lease-Lend* material the British government made an exception of special cases, such as parts to complete installations already under construction.

5) The British promise to control distribution of *Lease-Lend* goods in the United Kingdom so that there "will be no more than a fair return for services rendered in the work of distribution" and this will be mainly through government agencies.

6) No food obtained through *Lease-Lend* will be sold at uncontrolled prices.

7) Free distribution of such goods as milk products will be adopted in some cases.

Final returns in our recent "JUBILEE" prize circulation contest were so heavy that announcement of winners cannot be made until the issue of October 6 — next week.

In computing a competition of this nature, great care must be exercised in auditing and re-auditing returns. In some instances contestants are so close that the difference of one new subscription sent in during the campaign would affect the amount of the cash prize.

We ask contestants to be patient for one more week — and then you will hear the big news.

Churchill on the Skids

MORE AND MORE evidence continues to pile up that Prime Minister Churchill will have to step out as the No. 1 front man in the British Government.

Attack after attack has been leveled at him in Parliament, culminating with the unprecedented verbal onslaught of William Gallacher who called Prime Minister Churchill a "blackguard" to his face and accused him of "dirty, cowardly, rotten action," in an angry outburst in the House of Commons.

True, he later apologized, but such a "nail, even though withdrawn, leaves an ugly hole."

It was not so much the attack as what lay behind it that gives us a glimpse of the carefully concealed situation in England.

Add to this the attack of Henry George Strauss, Conservative member of Parliament, who criticized the Roosevelt-Churchill "Atlantic charter" as an "obviously predominantly American document" and a mistake.

"Most of us," he told the House of Commons, "would do a great deal for Anglo-American friendship, but one of the things we ought not to do is too readily to agree with the magniloquent general declaration of principles which was put forward by a nation which made profound mistakes about Europe at the end of the last war, and shows every sign of making similar mistakes at the present time."

Again, we have the outburst of Emanuel Shinwell, who recently blasted the Prime Minister. According to an I.N.S. dispatch from London, he said:

"Churchill's resentment of criticism is hard to understand. He, himself, was the chief critic of his day and generation, therefore, it doesn't lie in the mouth of Churchill to complain of criticism.

"Churchill doesn't sack his failures, he promotes them!

"Indeed, your best choice of promotion in this government is to commit blunders, then you'll have real opportunity of becoming a big shot.

"In accordance with the technique of this government, Oliver Littleton, Alfred Duff-Cooper, Malcolm MacDonald and others have been sent abroad.

"In fact, the colonies and dominions are becoming the dumping ground for government failures.

"There is no room in this country for dictators. Our task is to fight dictatorship, not to encourage it."

* * *

William Gallacher's outburst came about over Trade Union charges that Col. J. T. C. Moore-Brabazon, distinguished Minister of Aircraft Production of England, had expressed a hope that the Russian and German armies would annihilate each other, and leave Britain dominant in Europe.

Gallacher asked Churchill "to clear out of this Government anyone who is not 100 per cent for co-operation with Russia."

Gallacher asked if the statements attributed to Moore-Brabazon represented the Government's policy.

Prime Minister Churchill in reply first needled Gallacher by the statement:

"I do not think I should be prepared to receive guidance in policy or conduct from an honorable gentleman who, it is notorious, *has to change his opinions whenever he is ordered to by a body outside this country.*"

Gallacher is a Communist.

Churchill pointed out that as Minister of Aircraft Production, Moore-Brabazon had authorized the sending of hundreds of fighter aircraft to Russia, that he was wholeheartedly in accord with the expressed British policy of aid to Russia and was with Britain heart and soul. "Otherwise, I should not have appointed him."

Mr. Churchill probably signed his political death-warrant by this stout defense. He betrayed his love for Britain as being above his regard for Russia.

* * *

The financiers and internationalists are hoping to throw Churchill overboard by the power and pressure of organized labor and put in as Prime Minister probably Bevin, possibly Beaverbrook — men whom they know will carry out the plans for a Socialist Britain, achieved only through a continuation of war.

Mr. Bevin, it will be remembered, addressed a Rotary Club Luncheon on November 20, 1940, and outlined his policy of social security, wherein he said that after the war, the whole English economy — finance, organization, science, and everything — would be directed towards social security which is the new name, or rather his name, for Socialism.

Mr. Bevin, no doubt, is familiar with the policy publicized by the British Socialist Bodies in 1893 when they said:

"Our aim, one and all, is to obtain for the whole community complete ownership and control of the means of transportation, the means of manufacture, the mines and the land. Thus, we look to put an end forever to the wage system, to sweep away all distinctions of class, *and eventually to establish national and international Communism on a sound basis.*"

That is the long range plan.

Wars, depressions, financial crises, overthrow of kings and governments, are only incidents in the march toward the ultimate objective.

We know from the international Communism of Russia, and the national Socialism in effect in Germany, that complete ownership is to be vested in the unscrupulous few who rule from the top of the pyramid. The lot of the rest is abject, servile, slavery.

Bevin, you may recall, said at the same luncheon, that he "did not mind revolutions if they were well directed."

Bolshevism Comes First

IN HIS column of personal editorial comment, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, says of the Moore-Brabazon incident:

"Col. Moore-Brabazon, distinguished Minister of Aircraft Production in England, is accused violently in Britain of having 'voiced the hope that Germany and Russia would exterminate each other and leave Great Britain the victor.'

"That would seem to be nothing particularly reprehensible about that utterance and desire on the part of anyone sincerely interested in the welfare of the British Empire.

"But the peculiarity of the war situation in both Britain and America is that the great body of ultra radicals appear to be more interested in the success and survival of Bolshevist Russia than they are in any other phase of the military or political situation . . .

"All of which brings up the plain and pointed question:

" 'What on earth is all the shooting about?'

"What are we fighting against and what are we fighting for?

* * *

"If we are fighting against totalitarianism as a foul principle and oppressive policy, why in the name of high heaven should we not desire to see the two totalitarian powers exterminate each other and destroy not only the principle, but the practice of despotic government.

"If we are citizens — or subjects — of a genuine democracy and if we are devoted to the ideals of democracy and honestly desirous of preserving and perpetuating those ideals, why should we not desire to see the enemies of democracy destroy each other?

"Why should we not long to see democracy raise its strong structure — its temple of liberty and justice — upon the ruins of all totalitarian tyranny?

"But no! In both Great Britain and America the ultra radicals want to see Russian tyranny preserved.

"They do not object to despotism if it is despotism of a class and despotism of their class.

"They hate the brutal tyrant, Hitler, but they love the bloody tyrant, Stalin.

"No country which fights for Russia can claim to be honestly opposed to tyranny, since Bolshevism is the basest and bloodiest tyranny that has disgraced the supposed civilization of Europe since the time of Ivan the Terrible.

"No country can truthfully claim to be crusading for democracy and the four freedoms when it is supporting a tyranny which is the most evil enemy of democracy — a tyranny where all the four freedoms have been brutally suppressed — a tyranny with no liberty, no opportunity, no morality, and no God.

* * *

"Sympathy with Bolshevism is not confined to Britain.

"It is just as prevalent and pronounced in the United States as it is in England —

(Continued on Page 10)

Comment

(Continued from Page 9)

or was in France before that nation's fall.

"All sorts of strikes and sabotage impeded our construction and shipment of war material when we were supporting the democracies of Europe, and opposing both totalitarian tyrannies.

"But when we changed our national policy and supported Russian tyranny and sought to bring the bravely battling democracies of Finland and Esthonia and Latvia and Lithuania back into the grip of Russian despotism — when we made a virtue of feeding the civilized Republics of central Europe to the greedy maw of the medieval Bolshevist bear, the interference with our construction and transportation of war material suddenly ceased.

* * *

"Our Communist fifth columns were as a rule — satisfied with a policy which sustained Communism in Russia and stimulated its spread over the rest of the world.

"But the ultra radicals in America are not even contented by the alliance of Russian tyranny with our country and the support of Russian Communism by our Government.

"These extreme radicals openly object to any activity of any American organization in behalf of democratic ideals and traditional American principles and policies.

"It is an evil in the eyes of these ultra radicals for Americans to desire to keep their beloved country out of the devastation of war.

"It is the unpardonable sin for Americans to wish to save the flower of American youth from again being sacrificed on foreign fields.

"It is base betrayal of Bolshevism to express the fond hope (while giving all-out aid to England) that the totalitarian powers will exterminate each other and leave the democracies triumphant and unscathed."

U. S. Impregnable, Army Man's View

It Is a safe bet that Lieut. Col. Thomas R. Phillips of the United States Army would win no popularity contests in the War Department if its war-mongering chief, Secretary Henry L. Stimson, were judge.

The Colonel has committed the unpardonable error of declaring publicly that the United States is impregnable to invasion.

This is indeed serious when considered in the light of Mr. Stimson's hair-raising tales of imminent attack by Germany, and the President's spine-tingling "time-table of invasion," which he broadcast to the nation many months ago.

Since then, the President has shoved the United States to the very brink of war and has indicated quite clearly that he will go "all the way" in order to destroy the Nazi threat.

Those of us who refused to accept the defeatist attitude that America's independence depends upon the protection of a British fleet; those of us who have faith in America's own strength and our ability to repel any invader; those of us who know the folly of succumbing to the vicious war propaganda flooding America, have been labeled "Nazi tools."

Is the United States Army harboring a "Nazi tool" in the person of Lieut. Col. Phillips?

* * *

According to a dispatch to the *New York Times*, Col. Phillips, in an article prepared for publication in *Army Ordnance*, official organ of the Army Ordnance Association, asserted that the development of air power has made this nation safe from attack by sea.

In other words, the very factor that warmongers insist has made us vulnerable, actually has made us impregnable.

"Even if the United States had no harbor defenses, it would be impregnable to invasion," Col. Phillips wrote. "And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of an invading power."

An attacking force demonstrably can be driven back by land-based bombers and fighting planes, he pointed out, using Britain's failure against the Nazis in Norway as an example.

"Almost no other event in the history of warfare equals this in importance," the Colonel's article continued. "For the United States, the conclusion is transcendental. It makes it possible for this country to insure not only its own continental territory from invasion but, by provision of a suitable air base and airways system, to insure the impregnability of all North and South America . . .

* * *

"The attempted counter-invasion of Norway by the British supplied proof of the well-established theory that sea-borne invasions are impossible against land-based air power. This operation took place under the most favorable circumstances possible for the British—nevertheless, the invasion failed . . .

"If the conditions under which an invasion would have to be attempted against the United States are visualized, it will be seen that the problem would be infinitely more difficult than the British problem in Norway.

"Leaving aside naval interference, imagine a convoy of 40 or 50 troopships crossing the Atlantic Ocean towards the United States. Their departure could not be kept secret. Our defending bombers would start attacking it a thousand miles from the coast. The invasion might not be stopped before it reached the coast, but it would be badly damaged.

"Imagine then, this convoy attempting to come into a harbor and remaining practically stationary for days with the entire bombing force available to the United States working on it. The picture is incredible! The invasion would be doomed. No military leader would ever think of making such an attempt."

* * *

So there seems to be a slight difference of opinion between Secretary of War Stimson, the Wall Street lawyer, and Lieut. Col. Phillips, whom the *Times* identified as a member of the Army General Staff.

So, perhaps, Col. Phillips is a "Nazi tool."

That—and worse—is what they have been calling Col. Lindbergh, who gave us the same information from the point of view of an aviation authority.

Minnesota Clubs Study Money

THE BASIC money question has rather been pushed into the background in the mad scramble for profits and jobs under the program of "national defense."

The notable exceptions to this neglect of the money question are the international bankers and their stooges in press and radio. This *clique* never takes time out, even for war; just now, they are becoming terribly worried about "inflation."

A study program sponsored by the Constitutional Money League of America is being set up in Minnesota, specifically at Rochester and Minneapolis. Depending upon the success of the Minnesota experiment, leaders and study groups are to be developed in other states.

Former Congressman Charles G. Binderup of Minden, Nebraska, president of the Constitutional Money League of America and William C. Gehrke, national organizer, are speakers at the money meetings.

Two of the 16 principles of social justice are covered in the lectures: notably, *abolition of the private Federal Reserve banking system and the establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank;* and *restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of the nation's money*—a control now exercised in private hands.

Mr. Gehrke, who is instructor in money and banking at Hastings Business College, Hastings, Neb., writes:

"Our hopes are based on the success of study clubs which will give us a group that is informed. Thus, we will rely upon intelligence rather than emotion or a mass movement. We are avoiding all other issues, and shall adhere strictly to our program of constitutional money.

"In a meeting yesterday where Mr. Binderup and I spoke, many of our audience came long distances to find the plan of action to work with us. One car load came 75 miles!"

Mr. Binderup, an active monetary pioneer in Congress, travelled over the world at his own expense to interview monetary experts and study conditions. His "money school for Congressmen," in his last year in the House, is still talked of in Washington. Of course, the banking interests saw to it that he did not return to Congress.

The first mass meeting was held at Plainview, 25 miles from Rochester, on September 13. Subsequently, a rally comprising ten counties in the Congressional district around Rochester; lectures before civic groups and schools; and similar meetings in Minneapolis, were held.

S. O. Sanderson is contact man for the League's study clubs at Rochester and the Rev. C. O. Stadsklev at Minneapolis.

Our Last Chance to Save Business, Hoffman Warns

UNDER THE direction of Leon Henderson, price czar and newly appointed arbiter of automobile production, the Roosevelt Administration is now "out in the open, determined to impose its planned economy upon all," Representative Clare Hoffman of Michigan declared last week.

He charged that the Government was seeking to drive small industries out of business by denying them materials essential for operation, and was assuming control of large corporations through the medium of the National Labor Relations Board, the National Defense Mediation Board and the Office of Production Management.

Countless industrial enterprises, the Congressman said, will be forced to close their doors and throw thousands of employees out of work, unless they are soon permitted to buy the materials necessary for production.

From all appearances the Government intends to do nothing about the situation, for Donald Nelson, executive director of the Supplies Priorities and Allocations Board, recently admitted that "some" businesses undoubtedly will have to close.

Despite all assurances to the contrary, at the outset of the defense program, the great bulk of defense and war contracts have been awarded to a few of the country's huge corporations, while hundreds of independent plants "go begging."

Thus, these small industries are deprived of defense work through no fault of their own, and are discriminated against in priority rulings because they are "nonessential" industries.

Hoffman charged that many of the alleged "shortages" of vital defense materials do not exist, but are "created" by the Administration as a part of its war plan and its scheme to nationalize all industry.

It is becoming increasingly more obvious, he declared, that the "Government intends to take over all business, re-make America as Wallace wrote. If it does, we will have Communism or Naziism, and the working man's lot will be no better here than abroad.

"Hence, the necessity, the utter necessity, for all those who would preserve our American system; preserve the opportunity which, heretofore, all Americans have had; to join in a united and determined effort to compel their Senators and Congressmen to repeal the legislation under which Henderson and the Administration are carrying out this ruinous policy."

The Michigan Congressman said that many employers, labor organizations and workers have discovered the futility of protesting to Administration officials because results are always unsatisfactory.

Therefore, he urged all those whose jobs are endangered by the Administration's bureaucratic control of industry to register vigorous complaints with their Representatives and Senators.

"Henderson and his ilk are determined upon their course," Hoffman warned, "and protests to them, arguments, even though they may be logical, mean nothing. It is different with your Congressman. You can get at them every two years and they will listen, because they must."

'Slaughter of the Middle Class'

AT THE present rate, it will not take long for "one section of the public to be completely ruined, *and all small individual enterprise crushed out of existence*," warns the *Patriot* published in London.

"That is the ideal aimed at by the planners, who want all business concentrated in a few hands when the middle-classes will have ceased to exist, and the workingman and woman will be placed where they have to take what is offered and no opportunity for bargaining.

"There is no liberty in such an outlook, nor is there any in the Socialist idea of the State enthroned, and it will be a sorry thing if we fight this war for freedom only to find it has resulted in involving the bulk of our own people in slavery to finance.

"With all the talk of the people cheerfully meeting the immense burden of taxation placed on them by the war," continues the London paper, "it is seen that they have no alternative offered them, and sour faces will take them nowhere. Let it be remembered that at the beginning of the Great War, the country (England) had a national debt of about $3½-billion; it finished that war with a national debt at least ten times that size, and is today paying nearly $1¼-billion annual interest thereon. What the figure of our obligations at the end of this war will be, as we are at present financing it, no man can say, nor what will be the amount of the annual interest thereon.

"There certainly seems to be something wrong in the way in which the banks are lending the national financial credit to the Government and receiving interest therefor, *though it is quite clear that these moneys belong to the people themselves and not to the banks.*

"This is a matter which has been consistently exposed for long past by the Service for Economic Action, but so far the Government has preferred to take no notice of the advice tended.

"The official policy is one of drift when a little vision would reveal the rocks ahead.

"In the face of all the destruction which is seen in our great cities, there is a continual suggestion of some wonderful New Order and reconstruction which are to put things right in Great Britain, but *where a New Order is most required — in the realms of finance — THERE IS SILENCE!*

"Yet, with a properly ordered national finance, *run for the benefit of the people, and not in the hands of internationalists,* the recovery of this nation from the havoc of war should not prove a superhuman task.

"Finance is the keystone in building prosperity."

* * *

There certainly can be no national prosperity anywhere, except the usurious system of debt bonds bearing interest to private exploiters be cashiered.

A great portion of the taxes we are called upon increasingly to bear is for interest profit to those who have seized the world's most valuable franchise — the *power to coin and regulate money.*

Instead of giving the American people an honest, debt-free, national money system, the "planners" are offering them nebulous social gains, social security for instance, and the people themselves are being taxed for it, instead of being given a living wage to meet their family obligations.

The "slaughter of the middle class" is taking place before our very eyes.

Will red-blooded Americans ever rise up against these Socialistic schemers who are breaking down American traditions, American ideals, and America's finest contributions to civilization?

Production for Peace

WE CANNOT defend ourselves or fight with dollars — we need guns, tanks, ships, airplanes, ammunition.

Similarly, we cannot eat, wear, or live in dollars, which are only useful as they enable us to acquire food, clothes and shelter.

Had we been able to see this clearly in the past decade — had we turned our immense productive machinery to making the things of peace, as we are now obliged to use it to produce the things of war—our standard of living would have exceeded anything that the world has ever seen.

We could have afforded it—indeed, the tragedy of the period is that we thought we could not afford it.

* * *

No, that is not a quote from one of Father Coughlin's broadcasts.

The author is Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, writing in the August number of *Fortune* Magazine.

"By the same token," Mr. Eccles continues, "when peace comes it is to be hoped that we shall have learned the lesson and that we shall produce for peace just as we must produce for war — up to the limit of our productive capacity.

"But there will be a great difference. What we produce for peace will make the world a better place to live in. Armaments protect but do not improve our way of life.

"If we learn to apply the sound economics of the engineer who thinks in terms of the production of tangible things, rather than the economics of the financial operator who thinks in terms of dollars, we shall have done as much to preserve democracy for the future as all the armies that could be mobilized."

Comment

Fr. O'Brien Calls War 'Stark Madness'

WAR never decides a moral question: any question of "right" or "wrong," over which it is always allegedly fought.

It merely decides, as SOCIAL JUSTICE said last week, which side has more guns, more bombing planes, more instruments of death, more cannon fodder.

The masses of the common people in all of the war-torn countries are the tragic victims.

After millions of human beings, God's own creatures, are slaughtered like so many dumb cattle; after cities are destroyed and old civilizations laid waste; and all sides are exhausted—a "peace" conference will be held.

Diplomats, wearing spats and *butonnieres*, and generals and admirals in gold braid, will assemble.

"You take this territory, and you take that," they will say.

Then, putting their papers into their *portmanteaus*, they will go home again.

But there are some things that they do not put back. Among them are the precious lives of the millions of poor human beings who were butchered to decide a "question of right," which can only be decided by the reason and the conscience of man.

Herein lies the folly and the tragedy of all war — it is meaningless, completely, utterly, abysmally meaningless!

Before the outbreak of the present war, both Hitler and Deladier warned each other that the only "victors" would be destruction and death.

President Roosevelt had previously reminded both Hitler and Mussolini that the World War proved that military victory was sterile; that it solved nothing, accomplished nothing.

"Nothing," declared the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, "is gained by war that cannot be achieved by peace; in war, all is lost!"

Time after time, His Holiness has set forth the ideals of peace which we all cherish.

"I shall not relax either my efforts or my pray[illegible] His Holiness declares, "for the cause of peace."

Every day, the Holy Father is praying and striving to bring peace to a war-torn world.

* * *

In his recent radio address broadcast over the Mutual network, the Rev. John O'Brien of Notre Dame University said:

"I have spoken of the tremendous losses in property and in human lives which modern war entails. The losses in the *moral and spiritual spheres* are not less appalling.

"Mercy, kindliness, justice, truth, patience, humility, meekness, tolerance, and Christ's all-embracing law of love are among the first casualties.

"War declares a moratorium on morality, and prostitutes the findings of science to the dirty business of mass slaughter.

"Flouting Christ's teachings concerning the dignity of human personality, the sanctity of human life, and the law of universal love—which teaches us to regard all men as our brothers, children of the same Father —war converts men into cannon fodder and uses as its explosive the dynamite of hatred," Father O'Brien continued.

Trampling upon the deepest teachings of religion which proclaims: "Love and save," war sings but one refrain: "Hate and destroy, hate and kill, hate and annihilate!'

"Even in America at peace, 3,000 miles from Europe's flaming feuds, we feel the repercussions of the fear, hysteria and hatred disseminated by the party clamoring for war.

* * *

"While religion and ethics justify a nation defending itself against unjust attack, let it be remembered that America, in spite of her own repeated violations of neutrality, has not been attacked.

"Before a war can be justified, ethics demands that in addition to a just cause, *there must be the exhaustion of all pacific means of settling the dispute*, and that the good effects outweigh the evil effects.

"What have we done to exhaust the possibilities of bringing the warring leaders to the peace table?

"Precisely nothing.

"Who would maintain that the good effect, if any at all can be found, will outweigh the monstrous and incalculable evils of modern total war?

"Reason compels us to say, therefore," Fr. O'Brien continued, "that there is not a shred of ethical justification for America entering the European conflict.

"The moral obligation not to enter that *blitzkrieg* of destruction is further deepened by the solemn promises, made time and again, by the President during the election campaign.

"Thus, in Boston, on October 30, 1940, speaking with a great depth of feeling, the President said:

" 'And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again. *Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war!*'

"No President in all history has given to the American people a more unequivocal, a more deliberate, a more solemn and sacred promise.

"The violation of that solemn pact between the President and the people would not merely be a breach of fundamental morality; but *it would blast more effectively than all the armies of Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini*, all faith, both at home and abroad, in democratic government as well.

"It would break the heart of the American people and the heart of democracy as well.

"I have faith in the President.

"I am supremely confident that, in spite of the war advocates who seem to surround him on every side, he will keep faith with the American people who have trusted him and honored him, as they have honored no other man in all our history.

"Let us help the President to keep that promise by writing to him and to Congress, each day, to keep our American boys out of the raging holocaust now devouring the manhood and the civilization of Europe.

* * *

"We must not be content, however, with mere opposition to war," Father O'Brien cautioned.

"The time has come when we must render an historic contribution to world peace. To continue the present orgy of destruction until Europe is in ruins and mankind is liquidated spells not merely the bankruptcy of statesmanship but stark madness as well.

"What the people of America want, what the peoples of all the European countries want, is a cessation of the stupid and brutal strife now consuming them.

"I join my voice with the noble voices of the venerable dean of the American hierarchy, Cardinal O'Connell, of former Ambassador John Cudahy, of Congressman Louis Ludlow, and of mankind the world over, in pleading:

"Now is the time, Mr. President, to summon the warring leaders to the conference table, to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace.

"That must be done, eventually, why not then before more millions of people are killed, instead of afterwards?

"No government will turn a deaf ear to an invitation coming in a spirit of fairness and good will from the greatest moral power in the world.

"It is not on the battlefield, but only at the conference table, that fair peace terms can ever be worked out. That cannot be achieved by violence, but only by the reason and conscience of men.

"If it be said that Hitler cannot be trusted, then let an association of nations establish effective, international sanctions.

"Ultimately, the present anarchy among nations, the worst menace to enduring peace, must be supplanted with judicial machinery to settle disputes and with a world sheriff to enforce the decisions of such an international tribunal.

"That development is as inescapable as the swing of the stars in their courses, if we are to halt the endless competition in armaments and the ever-erupting flames of war.

"If you will take the lead now, Mr. President, and throw all your magnificent talents, and the power of your mighty office, with the co-operation of Congress, into the Christ-like work of halting the brutal European strife, mankind will acclaim you above all the generals that ever lived.

"Better than a battle won, is a battle prevented.

"Better than a war won, is a war halted."

* * *

And what will be the response to Father O'Brien's plea? For one thing, we venture the prediction that it will be Administration pressure on the University of Notre Dame to "ride range" on that "wild" Father O'Brien; it will be Administration pressure on the radio monopoly to silence the "obstructionist" radio voice; it may even be some powerful "higher up" callers upon Prof. O'Brien personally with friendly but forceful counsel to "lay off."

We're not just guessing — *we know!*

Comment

Wyeth Williams— 'Authoritative Sources'

MR. WYETH WILLIAMS, the radio news analyst and commentator, whose "forecasts of today are the news of tomorrow," has attracted many listeners.

When other commentators painted glowing pictures of magnificent British and Russian victories, Williams was giving his hearers a black and despairing picture of the allies' plight as the Nazi juggernaut advanced.

Williams was formerly editor of the *Greenwich Times*. Mr. Frank L. Altschul, brother-in-law of Herbert Lehman of Lehman and Company, and a director of Lazard Freres, is Mr. Williams' patron.

Lazard Freres, with Lehman Co., is the second largest international banking concern in the world, having long ago outstripped Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

The Lehman combine acts as the financial co-ordinator of many of the aeronautical concerns who have received large Government defense contracts.

The combine, for example, owns and directs the American Export Lines and its transatlantic air service.

The Lehmans have made plenty of money out of national defense and from Uncle Sam's $7-billion bundles-for-Britain.

Y Y Y

Of course, the international financial combine has its friends and "creatures" rightly placed in Government posts and bureaus; so that the financial house not only knows Administration policies, but even helps in making them.

Mr. Altschul reportedly put in Wyeth Williams as editor of the *Greenwich Times*. Altschul's daughter, interested in journalism, has found entertainment reporting for the *Times*.

For instance, when Shirley Temple visited the Lehman children she had an exclusive interview with Margaret Altschul. All the big metropolitan daily newspapers had to use her "exclusive" interview and credit the *Greenwich Times* with the "scoop."

Y Y Y

Now, Lazard Freres and Lehman Brothers have their "listening posts" throughout the world.

International bankers must have their creatures in all the countries of the world in which they do business. These "creatures" are not only informers; they are also lobbyists who "take care of" the financial interests of their masters. Of course, they are well paid in position and in money for their trusted work.

The money masters were shocked to learn — *six weeks in advance of the actual fact* — that Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany would sign the pact of August, 1939.

No doubt Wyeth Williams has access to much of the information transmitted from financial listening posts in Europe, Asia and America, to Lazard Freres and Lehman Brothers.

Although Mr. Williams is a newspaper man, yet he hasn't the connections throughout the world among newspaper men generally, who could furnish him with such authoritative and accurate information.

Since his information "from certain authoritative sources" generally constitutes "scoop" material, it is evident that Mr. Williams could not have received the information from other newspaper observers, correspondents and eye-witnesses; because in that case they, too, would have sent the information to the newspapers they represent and by whom they are paid.

Since there are no "newspaper men" with either the Russian or German armies, Mr. Williams' information regarding the movements of these forces obviously comes from government listening posts from which some observer operates to send information to his money masters.

The international money masters, frequently, maintain a more efficient, extensive and better organized intelligence service than most governments; for, even within the government intelligence bureaus, men operate as "agents" for the money masters.

Y Y Y

A casual study of Mr. Williams' material indicates that much of it, directly or indirectly, affects finance.

Much of Williams' material, we repeat, is presented in such a form as to draw a despairing picture of the world economic war and its effect upon America's domestic economy.

For example, Wyeth Williams draws a despairing picture of the allies' chances to inspire America to greater efforts to aid the allies by men, munitions and money. This dark picture of Russia's and Britain's resources always helps to improve the money masters' business of making and shipping material to the "democracies."

Y Y Y

Moreover, Wyeth Williams has been associated with a propaganda handout known as *"The Hour."*

This weekly news service claims a reader and radio audience of 30-million!

The *Hour*, published by some kind of "committee against Naziism," is edited by Albert E. Kahn, a writer for the Communist Party line magazine *Friday;* and with Frederick L. Schuman, instructor of the Communist Workers' School, on its board of editors.

The *Hour* "exposes" purported Nazis and Fascists as a blind, but devotes its major effort to smearing anti-Communists. The *Hour* never attacks Communists or Communism.

The *Hour*, for example, has concentrated its efforts on "the exposure of" Father Coughlin and is the author of many vain attempts to link the silenced Radio Priest with activities of so-called Christian Front groups.

Many newspapers and radio commentators who featured "inside" information on the notorious Christian Front "conspiracy trial" drew largely upon the *Hour* for their data.

Walter Winchell, the Broadway keyhole gossip, relied largely upon information furnished by the *Hour* in exposes of Nazi and Fascist groups in this country.

Since the editors of the *Hour* boast that they reach 30-million people, it would seem imperative that Congress investigate such a powerful *agit-prop* instrument.

Since it is evident that the *Hour* does not profess to function as a propaganda group, Congress should discover by investigation the financial "angels" of this vast venture; the purpose of its *agit-prop;* the extensiveness of its propagandizing, its program and policies; and its tie-up with powerful subversive minority groups.

'Get Ready for a New Order in U. S.'

THE ABOVE injunction captions an advertisement of the America First Committee in New York City. This is one case where there is some good, informative reading in the advertising columns. We quote:

"American business is about to commit suicide. It is walking with its eyes wide open, without protest, drugged by propaganda and intimidated by war-makers, to its doom . . .

"New order economist-advisers of the Government have publicly boasted that, to survive, the Federal Government must spend not three billion but twelve billion dollars a year *permanently*. The war becomes a laboratory for their schemes.

Y Y Y

"If America goes into this war, the new order will come overnight. No part of our vast business machine will escape the most minute and comprehensive regimentation by an army of bureaucrats in Washington. With countless billions to spend, with patriotic hysteria aflame, no man will dare lift his voice against a single step.

"The plan of plant seizure by the Government — which was moderated under pressure — will be a mild measure compared to what will come and what will remain.

"The Government will have its man in every counting room, in every work shop, in every store.

"The Government will fix every price, will decide every man's production, do every man's planning, will take every man's profits in taxes.

Y Y Y

"When the war ends, with business exhausted and beaten, with a debt that strangles every producer, facing vast unemployment as the armies demobilize, the moment will be ripe for the final blow to the present order in America and for the great experiment in peace with the new order.

"The new order means very simply four things — taxes, debt, spending, regimentation."

This is what Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine have told the nation for a long time. There is no particular satisfaction, however, in being able to say we told you so.

Repudiation of Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE by certain unrepresentative but powerful directors in the America First Committee does not, of course, affect facts.

Letters

SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.

Consistent Record of Inconsistency

TO THE EDITOR:

It seems that we have two sets of morals: Things that are wrong for others are right for us. We twist the language to suit our vile ends.

We readily believe lies, while we refuse to accept the truth. We condemn dishonesty, but we do not pay our debts. We are ready to condemn others in the vilest terms, without demanding to know one wrong thing that he has done. We gloss over the greatest crimes in another, if it suits our purpose.

Germany "drafts" a man into the army to learn a trade; but when we force a man into the Army, to be morally exposed, we call it "selective" service.

When Germany had a peacetime army of 495,500 men we called it "militarism"; but when we have an army of 2-million we call it preparedness for defense.

We spend millions for foreign missions, while we spend billions to assist Communist Russia to overrun all of Europe and destroy all Christianity — even in Vatican City.

We want to force "four freedoms" upon all peoples, while at home we watch our own freedom disappear. We talk about freedom of speech, but we supinely allow a little *clique* to put the great Father Coughlin off the air.

We are the most peaceful country in the world, and we are the only country in the world that would go to war without a cause.

We denounce a government-censored press in other countries, and accept a press that is completely controlled by the bankers.

We prate of peace while we permit one elected public official to embroil us in war against the will of 80 per cent of the American people.

We demand freedom of the seas to send munitions of war to England and Russia, but not to send food to the starving people of Belgium.

We cannot even send a vessel from New York to Boston without England's consent!

We cannot send airmail to Puerto Rico that England does not open!

We give food to England, while one-third of our own people are underfed.

(P.S. You are permitted to use my name, if you wish.)

— **E.A.M.**

Mound, Minn.

Promise Breaking

TO THE EDITOR:

As earnest men and women of Christian America we are concerned over the onward march of paganism. We are anxious for our American youth.

Millions are not receiving any religious education. This is ominous, not only for Christianity but for democracy as well.

Neglect of religion leads to neglect of God. When men no longer worship God they begin to worship themselves. That is what the world's dictators are doing. They allow no sovereign beside themselves.

Such men assume, step by step, absolute powers. Having no regard for God Who is the Absolute Truth, they have no regard for truth at all.

So, they make promises and do not keep them; they give solemn "assurances" and pledges to their people, and with no qualms of conscience break them.

They would be compelled by religion to honor truth, to be loyal to their duties toward their God and their fellowman, and to make the exercise of their governmental powers subject to God's higher law.

These "liberals" want nothing to do with religion; they dislike it; they hate it; so they set out to destroy it.

— **Mrs. A.E.H.**

Genesco, North Dakota.

Still Not Too Late

TO THE EDITOR:

Let President Roosevelt make an earnest and sustained effort to end this mad war by peaceful means and he will — and at once — have 99 per cent of the people behind him in a solid *bloc*, even if he should fail in a peace attempt.

That is the only way he will ever get real unity. For then, after he makes an honest move to stop the war, should war for this country become inevitable, every man Jack of us 80 per centers would be ready to wage war with a will, if only to adhere to the first law of nature — self-preservation.

Are they so blind with selfish rage who cry for unity that they will not see and heed these self-evident facts?

The spirit of America can only go forward when it is free; it can only go backward under a forced will.

Had the President but heeded the Voice of Royal Oak about an honest money reform, instead of the mealy mouthings of the money-lenders, he would not now be confronted with the dual dilemma of national bankruptcy and international war.

Even now, it is not yet too late.

New York City. — **H.C.**

If Americans Knew the 'Plan' There'd Be an Awakening

TO THE EDITOR:

Just who is the President of the United States that he should assume to pronounce the sentence of death on my sons and other American sons by sending them into a foreign war, which he promised faithfully to keep out of and which Congress has not declared?

These Warbugs intend to protect our people and our property, so they say. Peculiar reasoning — to "protect" us by sending our young fellows against the powerful German war machine to be blown to pieces, and by forcing our people at home to descend to the living standard of European peasants!

President Roosevelt says the American people do not recognize the seriousness of the European situation. He sure is correct. If the majority of the people knew "the plan," and the set-up "behind the throne," F.D.R. would not have to lift a finger to awaken the American people. Ethan Allen, Ben Franklin, Sam Adams, George Washington and hundreds of other Americans attest that.

Anyone who has a few active brain cells knows that all this everlasting talk is hypocrisy designed only *to keep the people from finding out the truth until such time as it will not matter whether they learn the truth or not.*

Since Jo Stalin is now in the "fight to preserve Christian civilization," I am reminded of what Carveth Wells said in his book, *"Kapoot,"* back in 1932, when he and his party entered Russia on a tour of exploration.

Remember this was BEFORE F.D.R. was elected President. Off the beaten paths in Russia, Mr. Wells found pictures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and under the pictures the caption *"The next Communist President of the United States"!*

Mr. Roosevelt lost no time in recognizing the outlawed Soviet after his inauguration. He opened our country wide to the scheming, plotting Reds who have sworn to overthrow this Government and all other law-abiding governments, and to drive God from the world that He created.

To keep their dastardly work under cover and so fool the American saps, they constantly for years have hollered "Nazi! Nazi! Nazi!"

Point out one Nazi in official circles in Washington, D. C. — just one!

My own nationality is English and Irish; I am certainly not a "Nazi," but unfair play and dishonesty always affronts me wherever I find it.

Branford, Conn. — **J.T.S.R.**

Who's Buying the Bonds?

TO THE EDITOR:

In the last war the money changers were asked to buy the bonds, or were given first chance at them.

This time the multitude is asked to buy them, and you can start with ten cents.

The Big Boys got stung last time and they are fire cautious.

Another thing, if our Social Security money is lend-leased to Russia when will it ever be paid back, and in what form? If paid back in commodities, how will that help unemployment here?

— **G. MacK.**

Ardmore, Pa.

Veteran's Letter

TO THE EDITOR:

No one can afford to miss the vital world information that you are able to present to your readers. SOCIAL JUSTICE is one of the few remaining publications which dares to publish the truth. Every American patriot should support its torch bearers.

Nothing is the matter with America but the unworthy aliens who have been admitted to her hospitality, and who have shamefully abused Christian sportsmanship and tolerance to sack her commerce and debauch her institutions.

Furthermore, the British emissary, Lord Halifax, is openly feted, and hailed by our so-called free press as a messenger of right against might. Therefore, having witnessed England's democratic crusade in Germany after the World War — starving innocent men and women unnecessary months after the end of the conflict — I want to voice my opinion before it is too late.

I am not a coward, or a traitor to my country, to state that I will never again fight for the preservation of the imperialistic British Empire — which has clasped the blood-stained hand of Red Russia to save "world democracy."

The Tories who were responsible for the holocaust of the past centuries must be shorn of their power. Not until this "international gang" is eliminated, will the nations of the world be able to live in harmony and peace.

— **World War Veteran.**

Union City, New Jersey.

Ought to Welcome Probe

TO THE EDITOR:

If the film industry has nothing to hide, the movie makers would welcome an opportunity to testify before a Senate committee, in order to dispel any widespread suspicions that the films have been used to spread propaganda favoring United States entry into war.

— **H.D.**

New York, N. Y.

Letters

In Defense of Col. Lindbergh

TO THE EDITOR:

Speaking at Des Moines, Iowa, Charles A. Lindbergh uttered words of truth and spoke them without passion or hate.

Then, throughout America, an avalanche of false charges came down upon his patriotic head.

He merely pointed out the things that millions in America have long known—that the "three most important groups pressing this country into war *are the British, the Jewish and the Roosevelt administration!*"

Lindbergh spoke for the cause of peace and for this he is condemned.

Had he spoken for war, he would have been crowned a hero by nearly everyone who now casts mud at this fine American man.

Lindbergh did not say that all the Jews, nor even 1 per cent of them, were pressing for war; he merely pointed out that those of them who control the press, the radio and the movies are, almost without exception, pressing for war.

And you can bet your bottom dollar that Charles A. Lindbergh will never be given a chance either to prove his charges, nor even to answer and disprove the many false charges made against him — past or present.

Watch for the "candle snuffer" in the case of young Charlie Lindbergh!

Not so long ago another great American patriot dared to speak against those who were taking us into war and he was "taken off the air"!

Since that time, he has been berated many times on the air and in the "free" press of this great land, but NEVER has he been given the "freedom" of that same press or radio to defend either himself or the causes for which he stands — namely, the principles of the Prince of Peace and social justice for all!

By the very power of this unwarranted attack on young Charles Lindbergh, together with the false charges of "anti-Semitism" brought against him, those who would press the United States into war have eloquently proven the charges that the young patriot made against them!

How swift and loud is the defense of "Semitism" when it is even inferentially whispered against anywhere in the world: but when the followers of Jesus Christ are murdered by the millions — in Russia, in Spain, Mexico and elsewhere — one hardly hears a peep about it, and that long, long after those dire deeds are done.

The answer seems to be that we had better get back to God and His church if we are ever to have peace in the world.

United, we can have peace NOW. Divided, we will always be "driven" into wars.

Let us all hope and pray that Charles A. Lindbergh can and will go on fighting for sanity, for peace, for tolerance, for God and Country.

By all means let us not desert him now.

— **For Real Tolerance.**

Lindbergh Fine Example for Youth

TO THE EDITOR:

I have long been a reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE and enjoy it very much; besides keeping informed on the subjects so vital to America today that we, especially in this city (Cleveland), do not get in our newspapers.

In joining the America First Committee, and reading and writing a great deal, I am doing my best — and so are many friends — to keep our country out of Europe's war.

I have just written to congratulate the Rev. David C. Colony on his letter to Oumansky, quoted in a recent issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE. If more clergymen would adopt such an attitude it would certainly encourage Christian fathers and mothers, and our boys and girls as well.

Surely we do not wish to make Stalin's dream of world Communism come true — as he predicted it would if there could be a general war.

It seems to me that our Christian people should continue to hold Charles Lindbergh up to the youth of this nation as he is a good example of clean and honest American manhood; as against some of his critics who hang around the "Stork Club" maligning and circulating false rumors about those who disagree with their alien ideas.

In a future day we who are doing our utmost to help our President to keep his splendid promises; and who encouraged our Congressmen to be fair to our selectees, will be proud to remember that we were the real, loyal, Americans First.

We in Ohio are fortunate and we can be very proud of our splendid Congressmen and our Mrs. Bolton who feels as we do about Communism.

It seems to me that more and more patriotic Americans are becoming aware of their duties as citizens of our grand country; and will certainly help keep our *Constitution* in full force and effect and our America free of "Union Now" and all other treasonable "isms."

— **Mrs. A.M.H.**

Cleveland, Ohio.

A 'Catholic's' View

TO THE EDITOR:

It doesn't seem to me that our aid to Soviet Russia need be regarded as a "collaboration."

As a Catholic, I can see how it would be possible for me to look at it in the following way: We are simply *using* Russia to help destroy what would, possibly, become a greater menace to Catholicism than Russia is, were it allowed to triumph.

After victory, we may begin the war on Communism in earnest. Victorious Russia, it seems to me, would be easier to defeat than a victorious Germany.

This is, of course, a mere reflection by one rather ignorant of the facts.

— **R.H.**

Philadelphia, Pa.

Waiting for an Incident

—From the Chicago Tribune

Churches in Germany

TO THE EDITOR:

Why is it that we read so much about church "persecution" in Germany? Some time ago I saw in one of our Catholic papers that "95 per cent of the churches in Germany" were closed for religious services and used by the Nazis for other purposes.

The simple truth is, of course, that not a single Christian church — Catholic or Evangelical — has been closed.

A report in the official organ of Osnabrueck diocese says: "The German States pay annually 55-million R.M. for the salary of Catholic priests and collect 120-million R.M. church taxes for the benefit of the Catholic church alone.

"There are 96 schools for the education of priests. There are by far more students than needed. Greater Germany has now 50 dioceses, 12,000 parishes with 35,000 priests; 8,650 convents and monasteries with over 100,000 members."

No, the Nazis do not tear down the cross from the churches and put the swastika in its place; nor do we find any of their churches "*verboten*" for divine service.

It is Germany's old partner — Soviet Russia — now our ally — that bans religion and closes churches.

Chicago, Ill. — **J.L.W.**

Principle Is Important

TO THE EDITOR:

I dislike very much the tone of condescension in R.R.'s letter published in the Sept. 8th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine.

I am a Catholic — when the all controlling criminal usurers permit it — and I divorced myself from usury a number of years ago.

I believe that Al Smith was not defeated by the religious issue in 1928, for I understand that Mr. Smith received twice as many non-Catholic votes as he did Catholic ones.

Had Mr. Smith been a Republican that year I believe he would have been elected President. The "fundamental" difference between Al Smith and Hoover in 1928 was about that between F.D.R. and W.L.W. in 1940.

I hold no brief for Mr. Smith, any more than I do for the recent remarks of Bishop Hurley, and I also believe that R.R. is not a "representative" Protestant . . .

The greatest affront to the *Constitution*, American democracy, reason, liberty, justice and Christianity is the crude, criminal perversion of the all-controlling fundamental monetary principle of the United States *Constitution* — Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5.

This perversion of a sound fundamental principle which controls all our lives and all our economy, is concurred in by many Protestants, Catholics, Jews and others — wittingly or unwittingly.

Let's be fair and reasonable; let's "can" the baby talk!

Let us not confuse persons and religious labels with sound principles.

Rochester, N. Y. —**T.B., Jr.**

Letters

Unfair to Class

Fascist and Nazi

TO THE EDITOR:

I am, of course, in complete agreement with your views upon the political situation of the world, and especially of this country. But I wish to take an exception to one particular point, which it seems to me mars the fairness of your comment.

I refer to your August 18th issue (page 4, 1st col.): "The leaders of Fascism and Naziism have hobbled religious activities in every sector over which they have gained dominion."

As I know of no other place where Fascism has gained dominion except Italy and Spain, I believe that charge against Fascism is not substantiated by the facts and is consequently unjust and unfair.

It is hard to see how Fascism has "hobbled religion" in Italy, where it has happily and satisfactorily terminated a 70-year-old conflict between Church and States; where Free Masonry and Communism, and all unchristian sects, have been not only "hobbled," but practically driven out of existence; where the Church has gained a public position that she has never, perhaps, had before in history.

It is hard to see how Fascism has hobbled religion in that country where religious instruction forms an official part of the curriculum of studies in every public school, even up to the highest ones; where chaplains are appointed to every military unit even in times of peace; where the Canon Law is acknowledged as the law of the country in every instance where a conflict might arise.

If this is "hobbling religious activities," what more is required to make the Church free to unfold her activities?

What instance can be quoted of such "hobbling"?

To be sure, there was, years ago, an incident which threatened to get out of bounds and to become serious. But it was quickly composed. And even in that instance, which side brought it about? Is it not a fact that the politicians among the leaders of Catholic Action were found to have overstepped the limits agreed upon as their field of activity?

I think it is unjust always to tie up Fascism and Naziism together.

Fascism has, of course, its own faults and shortcomings, as has every human institution. But the differences, both theological and practical, between them are too many, too large, too definite, too deep, to permit an honest observer to confuse them and to place them under the same excommunication.

— **Rev. T.B.C.**

Atlantic City, N. J.

Double Soldier Pay!

TO THE EDITOR:

I was pleased to see that you published the names of all the Congressmen voting for and against the extension of the draft.

It might be well to impress upon your readers, especially every draftee, that each and every Congressman who voted for the extension of service *is the one and only Congressman* who is personally responsible for the boys serving another year and a half.

If this nation is genuinely in such great danger, why have not another million men been called for training in the last six months?

It is aggravating to think that even in our movie theaters, where we go for a moment's relaxation, we are pestered with collections for the U.S.O.

We are forced to give, without being asked, billions of dollars to aid the British Empire; and in order to provide our own boys with the simplest of comforts we have to beg for pennies and nickels!

The very least we could do for the boys in service is double their pay, so they would not have to depend on charity but they could select and pay for their own entertainment.

If anybody thinks a soldier's pay is already too much, let him enlist and get some of the easy money.

Brooklyn, N. Y. — **A.J.S.**

Wants a Question Box

TO THE EDITOR:

Would it not be feasible to install a question box in SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine?

After all it is the purpose of our paper to appeal to the common people.

Readers often do not comprehend fully the meaning of various articles presented.

To my mind a question box would be an excellent clearing house of information.

— **H.W.W.**

Union City, Indiana.

Gold in Control

TO THE EDITOR:

I have just finished reading your recent article on tin ore. To my mind it is one of the most astounding and unbelievable articles ever published in SOCIAL JUSTICE.

What pertains to tin in this nation, doubtless holds good for aluminum, rubber, and various other essential metals and products sorely needed today.

In 1933 there came into office in this land an administration that promised to "drive out the money changers" and turn this Government back to the people. We fools took this promise at its face value. And look at this nation today; the internationalists have taken over almost complete control.

They dominate our money system through the billions in private gold buried at Fort Knox for the benefit of "refugee Europeans" and "Asiatics."

Certain racials have been placed in high position and low, all out of proportion to their population; newspapers, the motion picture industry, the radio monopoly and every other device which might be used for propaganda purposes has succumbed to this "international vampire."

At this very hour a superhuman effort is being made to drag the armed forces of our great country into the raging "pro-Jewish—anti-Jewish war."

The Jew has won some notable victories in the course of history, but the greatest victory he ever won was the day he succeeded in forcing the English speaking peoples of the world into a war of revenge for the preservation of the ancient god of Gold.

— **J.M.G.**

Dayton, Ohio.

A New Reader

TO THE EDITOR:

I have just finished reading my first copy of SOCIAL JUSTICE and I want to tell you to keep up the good work.

I am a young man 21 years old and have a three year hitch in the National Guard to my credit. I am an American first, last and always; and I do not intend to die for any foreign country.

As a closing remark permit me to advise you to tell your readers not to discard SOCIAL JUSTICE when they have read it. Pass it on to a friend or acquaintance, so that more Christians can be awakened.

— **A.E.O.**

Jackson Heights, N. Y.

Correction, and Thanks

TO THE EDITOR:

As a friend of SOCIAL JUSTICE, permit me to call your attention to an error which, in a sense, is quite serious, inasmuch as it occurs in an article which presupposes that the writer is familiar with the successive reigns of the monarchs of England.

Under the title *"Doom of an Empire"* (Aug. 25) James II is referred to as the "son" of Charles II. James was, of course, the brother of Charles II, and the son of Charles I.

William of Orange, incidentally, had quite as much English blood in his veins as had James II. William's mother was a daughter of Charles I and sister of James II. The Stuarts were, of course, Scotch, though more remotely Irish.

As I admire the fearlessness with which SOCIAL JUSTICE publishes significant truth, I invariably pass my copy along where I think its influence will be felt; also recommending it whenever opportunity presents itself.

— **A.P.S.**

Philadelphia, Pa.

We Have the Machines; But What Is Our Belief?

TO THE EDITOR:

They have thought to arm this nation by diverting its industrial facilities to the making of weapons. They have ceaselessly said that this is a machine war, the outcome of which may be gauged by mathematically calculating the potential of factories.

If this were the only issue, surely ours would be the victory. For mass production was, and is, our contribution to this age.

But it goes deeper than that. It is not so simple as they would have us think.

They have castigated Hitler as a pagan, as a destroyer of Christianity, as a restorer of the ancient gods.

But withal their diatribe, this fact remains: if the gods of the German people be pagan, or if their gods be none but Hitler and the Reich, nonetheless their devotion is complete. In the frenzy of their adoration, there exists an element wholly spiritual.

None who has seen the German army in training or in action, will deny the fact of their self-abasement. An observer who in 1938 witnessed a group of German youths marching off, shovels in hand, to work on the roads, called it the most thrilling sight he had ever seen. These youths *believed in something.* The work about to be done was the ritual of their religion.

Through the centuries it has always been thus: men climb tall hills to suffer and die, gladly, joyously, for what they believe in. Humanity cries out for something to serve. 'Make us the altar-cloth of peace or the bloody door-mat of war. But make of us something.' The last words of the Christian martyrs are the same as the yelps of the German para-troops. Only the vernacular differs, and the intention.

Beside the machine, what shall we oppose to this weapon? Our beliefs? But what do we believe in?

Nothing. Nothing at all.

We have made the moral code a pattern for burlesque and idealized vice as a "way of life."

We have debased matrimony to the level of obscenity.

We hold human life as something less than nothing.

Our politics is a synonym for "racket."

Millions of us — Catholic and Protestant — go to church as a matter of form, not of practice.

What do we believe in? A new car every year, a house in the suburbs, a radio in every room. In this sense, perhaps, we have a pagan religion. But actually we are the nihilists, not the Germans.

The American way of life has been described as liberty, freedom, and conscience. But we have extenuated liberty to the point of license, and obliterated conscience. As for freedom, the word is misapplied: for freedom means restraint.

We shall match machine for machine. But with what shall we meet their "religion"?

— **B.M.**

Dorchester, Mass.

Letters

Jews Victims of Unwise Leadership

TO THE EDITOR:

The *New York Daily News* (Sept. 10) in an editorial entitled, "What Is Anti-Semitism?" placed the Ku Klux Klan and the "Social Justice Front" in a single grouping.

"Such people," the paper said, "want the Jews restricted by illegal, or legal, if possible, methods."

Now, of course, nothing is further from the truth. All we readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE want is to expose the false leadership and subversive activities of anti-Christians who in some cases are not Jews at all, but power-hungry pro-war anti-Americans.

They play on the heart strings and racial prejudices of the innocent masses, both Jew and Gentile alike — one against the other to gain their own selfish ends — more money — more power.

The "Social Justice Front," which the *News* speaks about, wants peace and social justice. It wants *an honest monetary system*, and a *decent living annual wage* for all who are willing and able to work.

Let the New Dealers answer for the Ku Klux Klan — they seated one of the Klan's former members of top rank among the "nine old men."

Why are the Jews, who are so wise in every other way, so blind that they "cannot see the forest for the trees"?

They have been welded into a most unwise economic *bloc* by their false leaders, under the pretext that "theirs" was a religious *bloc*. They have been unwisely taught to use the economic boycott and this most inimical weapon has always reacted against them, in the only way it could, as a boomerang.

Boycott breeds boycotts, then hate, intolerance and, finally, war.

Here in this land of many races and creeds — here, too, war is being bred, and by whom? and for what?

Not alone by the "money changers" in high places, Jews and Gentiles alike, but by those who can and have been bought by "thirty pieces of silver."

There is only one hope for the future of humanity; it rests here in the United States of America and it depends on our staying out of war.

Bronx, N. Y. — **C.H.**

Persecution Is Alien

TO THE EDITOR:

I see where Mr. Wendell Willkie of "campaign oratory" fame is yelling "persecution of the Jews," now that the movie industry is getting a little airing before a sub-committee of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The American people by now are all too well acquainted with that hackneyed phrase.

Where was this same *clique* when Keyhole Winchell was yelling for the necks of those young Americans of the Christian Front, who have since been exonerated by a jury and by the American people — all except Winchell and his *clique*?

Was there any nation-wide howl of "persecution" in the case of the Christian Front boys? No, that is an "alien phrase." Was there any cry of persecution when Father Coughlin was denied time on the radio? No, he is an American. Was there any yell about the "persecution" of Dr. Francis Townsend? No, he too, is an American.

Americans are not yellow; they will fight for themselves and for their country when it is in need — but they refuse to be pushed into somebody else's war.

Persecution and boycott are alien ideas. They used it on Henry Ford over 20 years ago; they are trying it on the *Chicago Tribune* now.

Now that these alien ideas are brought to our attention why not use them for our benefit.

Read SOCIAL JUSTICE which helped to educate us.

Milwaukee, Wis.— **A Former Sap.**

Honest Men Want Truth; Honest Papers Tell It

TO THE EDITOR:

An editorial in the *New York Daily News* (Sept. 10) reads as follows:

"People who are accused of anti-Semitism fall into two quite different categories. The first category is represented by the Ku Klux Klan and the Social Justice front."

I personally heard many of Father Coughlin's radio talks, and have read many issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, and never have I read or heard any proposal that the Jews be harassed in any manner.

The "Social Justice front," as the *Daily News* calls it, has been a hard fighter for justice — a fight which means exposing all evil doing wherever found and by whomever committed. In this fight Gentiles as well as Jews have been exposed.

SOCIAL JUSTICE began its fight against Communism long before the general public was aware of the dangers of Communism.

SOCIAL JUSTICE long ago outlined the folly of our participation in foreign wars.

SOCIAL JUSTICE has just exposed (by quotation from the *Technocrat*) how our own tin supply is neglected because an internationalist *clique* prevents its development.

Since SOCIAL JUSTICE exposed the Communist movement and traced its perpetrators down to their beginnings in Soviet Russia and the philosophy of Karl Marx, the magazine has been called "anti-Semitic." If SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine can be called anti-Semitic for publishing the facts, then the British and U. S. Government bureaus could likewise be called anti-Semitic because they first published the facts which SOCIAL JUSTICE quoted.

Communist tactics decree that all opposed to Communism must be smeared in some manner; and the "anti-Semitic" tag applied to its opponents seems to serve their purposes for the time being. At some other time, perhaps, they will use another type of smear.

SOCIAL JUSTICE published the fact that a Jewish Congress meeting in Washington, D. C. — in 1938, I believe — condemned Naziism and Fascism but refused to condemn Communism. If a Jewish magazine had reported the same fact, would it be "anti-Semitic"?

If you publish the fact that Roosevelt wants to get us into war will you be anti-Christian? But, if you say that certain powerful Jews want war, you will be called "anti-Semitic."

If SOCIAL JUSTICE can be called anti-Semitic then it can also be called anti-Christian, because it condemns evil done by anybody, whether Jew or Gentile.

Was Jesus Christ crucified because He was anti-Semitic or because He condemned their evil doing? We all know that Christ loved all men, and condemned only evil.

I am really disappointed when the *New York Daily News* classes SOCIAL JUSTICE with the KKK.

Millions who read SOCIAL JUSTICE are anxious to know the truth, no matter where it comes from. Whether the facts are pleasant or not, we want the truth. All honest men want truth.

Since I am only a mere reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine you can understand that I am imbued with a sense of fairness and justice when I come to its defense against an unjust accusation; especially so since the accusation comes from the *New York Daily News* which I believe to be also a fighter for justice and therefore open to reason and factualities.

New York, N. Y. — **C.B.**

It's Not the 'Dumb and Stupid' Who Make the Policies

TO THE EDITOR:

J.K. states that one lone, unidentified Jew does not represent "the Jews"; and that there "are dumb and stupid in every race." True.

But would J.K. impute that Jewish rabbis, Jewish editors, Jewish professors, Jewish bankers and other members of the Jewish intelligentsia are stupid and dumb?

Does J.K. think that the Gentiles have already forgotten the insults heaped upon Father Coughlin by the responsible leaders of the Jewish intelligentsia in America?

Jewish leadership is militantly anti-Christian, and Jewish internationalism is fighting another world war to prevent the possibility of the establishment of a new commercial, economic, and social order based on the principles of Christian social justice.

President Roosevelt is the "office boy" of the American Jews; just as Stalin is the "office boy" of Russian Jews, Premier Blum was "office boy" of the French Jews, and Churchill is the "office boy" of the Jewish controllers of the British Empire.

Jewish government officials and Jewish Freemasons dictated the foreign policy of Mexico and have foisted an anti-Christian educational system on the Catholic population of that country.

Prior to the conquest of Europe by Germany and Italy, the Jews, through their private money system, which they forced on all nations, regulated the money and currency of all the large nations.

Persons who read SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine regularly are not deceived by those Jewish spokesmen who claim to have taken the "kosher keely cure."

About two years ago, Jewish councils in one of our largest cities — the "typical Jewish folks, brothers, sisters, parents, cousins, uncles, aunts," etc. — denied Christian children who attended public schools the privilege of singing Christian carols during the Christmas holidays. And this in a — supposedly — Christian country.

Through their absolute control of the radio monopoly, the motion picture industry, and the large influential newspapers, and also to an alarming extent through education, Jewish leadership is de-Christianizing the Christians slowly but relentlessly.

About two years ago a prominent rabbi advocated Communism; and a Jewish professor accused the Legion of Decency of being a "puerile" organization.

Another Jewish intellectual, speaking before civic clubs in Wisconsin, stated that "Christianity is a failure"; that it never had functioned because it had been forced on all nations down through history, and is "the cause" of the misery and suffering existing in the world today.

He also stated that the Jews are a superior and a proud race, too proud to serve "under Gentiles." He implied that Gentiles might embrace Judaism, then there would be peace and prosperity in this world.

When any individual criticizes Jews for their anti-Christian policy, or points out Jewish criminal actions, he is ridiculed, slandered and persecuted by the Jewish press, and by the "typical Jewish folks" J.K. speaks about.

Oshkosh, Wisconsin. — **F.S.**

Militant Paganism

Magazines Lead Assault on Christian Culture

IF ANYONE still doubts the fast-growing paganistic materialism in this country, which finds expression in books and widely read periodicals, he will do well to read the recent report by the United Catholic Organizations Press Relations Committee.

Naming specific offenders, the report confirms Pope Pius XII's charge in his address to the Eucharistic Congress last June that "there is a stronger current of black paganism sweeping over peoples today, carrying along in its onward rush newspapers, magazines, moving pictures, breaking down the barriers of self-respect and decency, undermining the foundations of Christian culture and education."

The committee originally was formed to combat anti-Catholic representations in the press, but in response to His Holiness' warning it expanded its field to include anti-Christian influences in general, as described by the Holy Father.

The following report, according to *America,* the Catholic weekly, is the first of the enlarged committee reports presenting samples of paganistic trends selected from some of the better known magazines:

"*Ladies' Home Journal* (circulation, 3,650,318) July and August: Bette Davis, penning her autobiography, expresses impatience with people who are unhappily married but live together because of the children. Beatrice Blackmar Gould contributes this false statement: 'Many of the earlier saints . . . sought only to save their own souls, letting the world go hang.' The general tenor of *How America Lives; No. 19 in Series,* endorses birth control. The arrival of two children in the early years of a marriage is deplored. 'Lois (the wife) might have learned (housekeeping) easily,' if planned parenthood had not failed.

"*Collier's* (circulation, 2,790,465) July 26, August 16: *Poor Man's Garbo,* by Ted Shane. Glorification of a strip-tease girl and her disrobing act. She is described as leaving 'the third year of a parochial high school,' and overcoming 'her innate modesty' in order 'to help her family.' A short story, *'Ending With Honor,'* by Will F. Jenkins, imparts to a wronged husband something like heroic stature because he grants a divorce to his sinful wife. With this, the sinful lovers can be married, and the story ends on a note of 'they lived happily ever after.'

"*Harper's Bazaar* (circulation, 207,329) July: *'A Border Incident,'* by John Cheever. A woman, given the name Slattery, and made out to be a practising Catholic who goes to Mass on Sunday 'before breakfast,' sins with a man merely to find out if he is a German spy, as suspected by other boarders at a summer resort hotel. When she discovers he is not a spy, she cries out before the others at the hotel: 'Mary, Mother of Jesus, I've sinned. Mary, Mother of Jesus.' There is nothing in the plot calling for a Catholic. The fact that the author has gone out of his way to make a despicable character a Catholic imparts to the story a strong anti-Catholic twist.

"*Reader's Digest* (circulation over 4,000,000): In the August issue, an article, *'Don't Have An Abortion,'* by Jane Ward, taken from *American Mercury,* points out the dangers from quack abortionists, but gives the following pagan advice: (1) solution is better birth control; (2) abortion by trained surgeons, if needed. Legalization of this form of murder is suggested; the Commandment, 'Thou Shalt Not Kill,' is totally disregarded. *Digest* issues for December, 1940, January and April, 1941, carried condensations of two books in which the Catholic Faith was made to look ridiculous. The books condensed were *'To the Indies,'* by C. S. Forester, and *'The Donkey Inside,'* by Ludwig Bemelmans.

"*McCall's* (circulation 3,150,195) July, August: In a fiction story, a woman, though stricken with an incurable disease and preparing for an early death, never thinks of religion. *'Where the Heart Belongs,'* by Phyllis Duganne, portrays a couple drifting toward divorce. The wife, painted as a martyr to her husband's vicious habits, accepts the attentions of another man, who wants to win her via the divorce courts. An editorial discussion implies that 'the doctrines of faith' are not so important as 'the simple problems of simple people.' *'A Doctor Needs a Wife,'* by Eriak Zastrow, narrates a tale of distressing marital infidelity.

"The *New Yorker* (circulation 156,548) August 2: *'Search Through the Streets of the City,'* by Irwin Shaw, consists of a protracted discussion between two former lovers concerning their previous sinful relations. The story reeks with suggestiveness, even narrating a scene that had happened when they were in bed together. For more than a year, the *New Yorker* frequently has thrown open its pages to the contemptuous and blasphemous use of the Name of God and the Name, Jesus Christ. This issue of August 2, for example, links the Sacred Name of Jesus Christ with Gypsy Rose Lee, James Joyce, sex, liquor.

"*Time* (circulation 805,345) July 21 and August 18: 'Evidence of a schism between U. S. mores and the thinking of the Roman Catholic Church came from three widely scattered quarters . . .' The evidence as cited by *Time* is: (1) American newspaper reports stated that many Catholic leaders in South America 'view U. S. policies with suspicion'; (2) Roberto Farinacci, in Italy, praised Catholic isolationism in this country; (3) Father Blakely in *America* criticized the Army for stocking contraceptives, characterized such practice as a 'direct incitement to vicious courses.'

"In the above, *Time* . . . lugs out the phrase, 'the thinking of the Roman Catholic Church,' classifies under that heading the thinking of any individual Catholic on any topic which suits *Time*'s purpose at the moment. It is rather singular that *Time* should use Farinacci in connection with 'the thinking of the Roman Catholic Church.' Farinacci is a rabid anti-Catholic. Could it be that this fact is news to the newsmagazine?

* * *

"In one of its book reviews, *Time* remarked: 'Chief difficulty in writing about Christian goodness is that almost nobody believes it is possible.' In one of its science write-ups, it groups 'the Church' with the Nazis as opponents of evolution.

The *Atlantic Monthly* (circulation, 99-715). In the December, 1940, issue, *'The Guilty Ones,'* by Sholem Asch, subtly undermines the historicity of the Gospels. *'Black Lamb and Grey Falcon,'* by Rebecca West, in the February, 1941, issue, falsifies the position of the Vatican and the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia. In the April number, Albert Jay Nock slurs 'organized Christianity.' In the July, 1941, number, *'American Business and Hitler,'* by Douglas Miller, says if 'Hitler wins in Europe, he will control the Pope . . .' The author then speculates on what American Catholics will do in such an event. Will the Church, he inquires, 'have to consent to a political compromise in so far as American Catholics follow their Church? These speculations raise alarming possibilities for the future.' These 'speculations' read amazingly like some 'speculations' which the old Ku Klux Klan used to publish.

"*Cosmopolitan* (circulation 1,547,198) July-September: *'Temporary Address — Reno: The Long Journey,'* by Faith Baldwin, throws the aura of nobility around suicide. Gerry, the wife, in Reno to get a divorce requested by her husband, kills herself. 'Gerry has sought what she thinks is best. Who can blame her? Gerry has taken her long journey. Surely happiness was at the end of it.' Millicent, the other woman in the case, is also in Reno for a divorce. After Gerry's suicide, Millicent could now begin her 'journey into life, an honest traveler . . . awakened to the dignity and integrity of the struggling human spirit.' *'The Marriage Ring,'* by Ann Pinchot, makes a heroine out of a woman who is living with a married man. The man's wife is a mental case. In *'Answer to Life,'* by Pearl S. Buck, love comes to a married woman, etc. Rex Beach's *'Summer Madness'* gives us a widow wedding a boy twenty years younger. The widow knows the marriage will not last. When her boy hubby falls in love, she is a good sport and generously gives him a divorce. In *'Wild Is the River,'* by Louis Bromfield, we see a woman who runs a house of ill-fame, going to early Mass to pray. Arthur Gordon's *'The Wolves of Darkness'* outlines for us a woman of no morals, who though married, looks upon her wedding vows as 'campaign oratory.'

"*Woman's Home Companion* (circulation 3,439,737) August. In *'Panama Threat,'* by Brenda Conrad, love comes once more to a married woman. Her husband agrees to give her a divorce. 'Andy (not her husband) was standing in the hall doorway. She closed her eyes and waited. She could hear him coming across the terrace toward her.'

* * *

Comments *America:* "The examples in the above report are taken from only the better-class magazines, and from but a few of these. The accumulative effect of such instances is powerful. One little drop of paganism or anti-Catholicism may not do much harm. Many little drops united to form a constant and rushing current wreak dreadful havoc. It is of this accumulation that the Pope speaks."

Anti-Semitism in Congress

THE *Jewish Criterion* (Aug. 29) offers the following leading editorial, *"Shadows on Capitol Hill,"* to show how anti-Semitism is gaining ground in the halls of Congress.

"An alarming situation has developed in Congress. Speeches with an anti-Semitic flavor are becoming more frequent. Among Southern Congressmen it is now considered smart to lash out against the Jews.

"The most disturbing example since the outburst which precipitated the death of Congressman Edelstein occurred last week following the adoption by the House of the bill extending the term of selective service. Representative Cox of Georgia chose as his target Congressman Adolph J. Sabath of Chicago, a veteran Jewish legislator revered by all for his thirty-five years of service in Congress.

"What were the weapons that Congressman Cox used in his vicious anti-Semitic attack? First, that Congressman Sabath had not been born in this country and second, that he was associated with Communists.

"One cannot determine exactly whether or not Cox mentioned the Jews as such. His speech was withdrawn and therefore does not appear in the *Congressional Record*. But the reflection on the Jewish people was unmistakably clear.

"The pattern of his circumspect attack betrayed the *Nazi technique*. Since the isolationist legislators and leaders appear to be traveling a political road helpful to Hitler, it is not surprising that they should adopt some of his methods. The anti-Semitic undertones which characterize their utterances in Congress and elsewhere are a clever maneuver to deceive the American people. Their objective is evidently to couple the Jews with the interventionists and thereby confuse and divert the great majority of Americans who are behind President Roosevelt and his policy of all-out aid to the countries that are seeking to bring about the destruction of Hitlerism.

* * *

"That such anti-Semitic demonstrations can occur in the House of Representatives is a sad indictment of this legislative body," the editorial continues. "There is nothing in the record of the deliberate attack on Congressman Sabath to indicate that the Speaker of the House took any action to reprimand the offending Congressman.

"Demagogic outbursts which border on subversive effort to stir up hatred cannot be included in the realm of freedom of speech. We have a right to ask the leaders of Congress to curb such un-American explosions which aim at the very heart of our democracy."

* * *

There is resentment in America today because the 4½-million religious Jews in our nation hold so many and such conspicuous positions in Government. As a matter of fact, there are more than 4½-million Jews in America if you count the racial Jews as well as the census of religious Jews.

But take these figures as they are, the preponderance of Jews in Washington — beginning with Judge Rosenman as assistant to the President, down to the overcrowded offices of Federal departments where Jews predominate — has had, and is having, a backwash.

The Jews are clever. But they lack judgment. They know how to get along. Unfortunately, perhaps, they know how to get along too well, forgetting that there are such things as racial diplomacy and social humility.

Unfortunately, the Jews, almost to a man, in Washington, are pro-war while 80 per cent of the American people are anti-war.

Years ago when religious Jews were asked to side in with Catholics and Protestant Christians in strafing Communism, they received the invitation as an insult, contenting themselves with the assertion that they were non-Communists.

It is not enough to be non-something or anti-something.

It is not enough to be anti-fire when your house is on fire.

One must be pro-water, actively engaged in putting out the fire — so actively engaged that one gets his feet wet, his clothes soiled, his face smeared and his hands cut.

But no; there was not enough social intelligence on the part of the Jews in America to adopt that policy.

In the fields of publicity, finance, commerce, communications, amusement and industry, the Jews have risen to perilous heights.

More power to them.

In the field of politics for which Jews have no adaptation, they have crashed the gate with the result that they invite recriminations from other racials.

The Jews were not adroit enough to retain a flag of their own and a land of their own. They were always in trouble, as the story of the *Old Testament* indicates—more serious trouble than their neighbors. Yet, they insist on trying to run the business of other lands politically — the one and only business for which a Jew lacks mental equipment.

Unquestionably, most Jews are introverts. They just can't help looking at the world through Jew-colored glasses; they just can't help gauging most things by the star of David. Consequently, Jews lean towards internationalism because they think all nations should fit into the same pattern which is found in the composite Jewish mind scattered among all nations.

A Jew is a businessman first, last and always. As such, he is inclined to labor under the impression that politics can be ordered on a business basis, forgetting the weak elements of human nature which are so compounded in the science of social psychology.

Whoever trys to run political economy on a purely business basis, on a purely mass production basis, on a purely percentage basis, on a purely profit basis turns out to be a failure.

The Jew should retire from the field of politics and government. He has no more business in that sphere than has a pig in a china shop. And this is said despite the record that some Jews have risen high in the field of statesmanship.

* * *

One recollects what General Hugh Johnson said several years ago when he was radio-arguing with Father Coughlin. The General's words were: "This is a Protestant country."

Without trying to justify the General's remarks, we admit that it is a Protestant country in the sense that Catholics and Jews, as religionists, are far in the minority; so far that Alfred Emanuel Smith could not garner enough votes in the South to be elected Federal dog-catcher; so far that the Jews in Government today, unconsciously, are lining up the South against them for the same reason that it lined up against Alfred Emanuel Smith.

No; this is not bigotry. This happens to be the way that the American mind is constructed. It is simply a fact that one should face. It fits into a nicety with the democratic theory of majoritarianism. Therefore, it is not indicative of anti-Catholicism or anti-Semitism if the majority of American people do not want *ex-professo* Catholics and *ex-professo* Jews running the political affairs of the United States of America.

There is little anti-Catholicism in industrial, commercial, professional or artistic life. There is little anti-Semitism in the same categories. But the minute a self-advertised Catholic or a self-advertised Jew tries to step into the highest offices of this nation at Washington, then there is opposition.

This opposition begins to spread from a political opposition to all other kinds of opposition including industrial, commercial and professional.

The Jews make a mistake in entering a field of endeavor which their racial plowshare is not suited to furrow.

True, they made this attempt in many other countries — and failed.

They will fail in this country as surely as they failed in Poland, France, Germany, Italy, England, Spain and elsewhere.

To wipe out anti-Semitism, there should be a drive by Jews against those Jews who insist on getting into Washington politics and viewing them, consciously or unconsciously, through the Jew-colored glasses of racialism.

Let the Jews remember that too many Americans are conscious of some of the tenets of Judaism.

Jews are so ultra-clanish that they frown upon a Jewish girl's marrying a Gentile boy because the *goyim* is not good enough. either morally or intellectually, for the girl.

And all Americans who are conscious of this can't help but wonder what Jews would think of the subordinated citizens should they be subjected to a Jewish President and his myriad of appointees such as Morgenthau, Hillman, Perkins, etc., etc.

There is a reason for the *Criterion's* "shadows on Capitol Hill."

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Mexico for the Mexicans!

LEFTISTS, Rightists, Revolutionaries and Reactionaries are all repudiated, and the Nazi swastika and the Communist star equally rejected, in the *"16 points" of Sinarchism* printed on handbills which are being circulated through the Mexican capital, reports a news dispatch syndicated to Catholic papers by the N.C.W.C. news service.

The circulars appeal for "the union of all Mexicans for the preservation of Mexico" and find acceptable only "the Flag of Mexico."

Mexico need not "hope for salvation from abroad," the circular asserts, since this will come only when Mexicans "exercise their rights and duties"; and when "all Mexicans co-operate" in this great task; and private interests are subordinated to the common good.

In affirming the right of private ownership, the statement quoted also champions "social conditions which would make it possible for all to acquire property"; and it condemns the "unjust inequality of a social state in which a multitude of beings live in cities, and a few inhabit palaces; where some lack the bare necessities of life, and others enjoy an abundance."

Sinarchism, according to the 16 points reported by the N.C.W.C., defends both the "equitable distribution of wealth" and "protection for the production of labor and capital honestly accumulated."

* * *

In condemning the class struggle, Sinarchism urges the union of capital and labor; rejects the exploitation of one class by another, but "works for the betterment of the collectivity"; for a Mexico that is free internally and externally; and affords political and economic independence.

It condemns the "violation of liberties" and repudiates the "tyranny of despotic States which absorb individual activities, enslave wills, and kill all private initiative."

In other words, says the dispatch, the Sinarchists claim to be a movement, not a political party, striving for a just government which will remain conscious of the fact that its authority is derived from the people.

The best indication of the growth of Sinarchism in Mexico, says the N.C.W.C., is the effort to smear it with the name "Fascist."

* * *

The organization itself, the news report continues, has always shied away from the word "party" which is too nearly synonymous with "political parties," and has adhered to its claim to being a "nationalist movement."

The whole movement is directed by a national committee, which works through regional committees in each State and which, in turn, directs the activities of the municipal committees and rural sub-committees.

It is said to embrace all social classes, but is particularly interested in the peasants and workers since it considers that among these people are to be found the deeply rooted racial virtues which will prove to be the salvation of the country.

* * *

Advocates of Christian social justice in America, Christian Americans who once dreamed of a national union to effect a 16-point reform, and who have watched the progress of the Christian States headed by Salazar, De Valera, Gen. Franco and Mussolini, will want to hear further from Mexico's Sinarchists with their "16 principles" of social justice.

Last Chance to Save Business
Keep Up Your Letters to Congressmen